THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. IX SEPTEMBER, 1924 No. 51

EDITORIAL

THE CHILDREN'S BIBLE, ETC.

Careful attention is due, and is sure to be given, to *The Children's Bible*,* and its correlatives, *The Little Children's Bible*,† and *The Cambridgeshire Syllabus of Religious Teaching for Schools*.‡ These volumes hang together as being the fruit of a common effort made in Cambridge by a committee representing the Church of England, the Nonconformist bodies, and the Teaching Profession, to draw up a Syllabus of Religious Instruction which should inspire the religious teaching in the elementary schools of the county area. A parallel committee was set up to consider the single administration of all elementary schools by the transfer of Church Schools to the Local Education Authority. The three volumes before us have therefore a special importance in that they express a considered policy. They purport to represent such positive advantages in the way of more efficient religious instruction to be offered in all schools in the area as will counterbalance the loss entailed through the surrender of the Voluntary Schools. Moreover, some of the best minds in one of our two older Universities have been enlisted in the cause; and it is evident that the goodwill of a number of interested parties, including the teachers, has been secured. Here, if anywhere, we might expect to see something emerge which would make us ready to abandon the anomalies of the Dual System.

The *Syllabus* is prefaced by an introduction, in which we can hardly be wrong in detecting the style of Dr. Nairne. It is for teachers, not children, and it is admirable, suggesting precisely the spirit and the knowledge in which we should wish

* Cambridge University Press, 1924, 4s. net.

† *Ibid.*, 2s. net. ‡ *Ibid.*, 1s. 6d. net.

them to approach their work. We wish we could say the same of the Syllabus itself. The authors are careful to make plain that it is to serve as a guide, not as a system of lessons. But as a guide to what? We cannot answer. We cannot discover any clear thread of faith or meaning running through the selections of stories from the Old and New Testaments here strung together. Perhaps a comparison will best illustrate our criticism. A few years ago a new edition of the *Winchester Syllabus of Religious Instruction* was issued for use in the Church schools of the Diocese; and we tell no secrets if we say that it was largely the work of Canon Storr. Not only has this Syllabus been keenly adopted by the teachers, but it has so impressed the minds of the Local Education Authority that a modified version of it has been prepared for use in the Council Schools—a fact which renders it a particularly good instrument of comparison.

One of the first things we note is that the Winchester Syllabus presupposes belief in the Christian Faith and the purpose of teaching it. Thus we are told why particular stories are chosen and grouped together. The Infants' Syllabus for the First Year, for instance, begins with a heading, "Stories showing the love of God manifested in our Lord Jesus Christ," and there follows a series of twenty-two narratives. The second series for this year comprises "Stories showing the power to live the Christ life by seeing the love, courage, mercy, and loving-kindness in the lives of the followers of Jesus Christ"; the third is entitled "Stories about our Unseen Father and our talking to and with Him." As we pass to the Juniors and Seniors, this heading is amplified, with true educational insight, into a statement of aim. Thus, the aim of the first Junior Course on the Life of our Lord is stated as:

> To teach why God became man.
>
> (*a*) To show that God is Love.
> (*b*) To seek and to save.
> (*c*) To show us how to live.

Guidance of this kind in a Syllabus takes up little space; and it is the most essential kind of guidance that a Syllabus can give. Its complete absence from the Cambridgeshire Syllabus is due, perhaps, to the fact that the Committee responsible for it contained few, if any, who had practical experience of religious teaching in elementary schools.

We have said that we cannot find any general scheme underlying the Cambridgeshire Syllabus. Here the Winchester

Syllabus is admirably clear. The Juniors' Syllabus for each year falls into four sections, named respectively (1) "Before the Coming of Jesus Christ," (2) "On the Life of our Lord," (3) "After Jesus Christ," (4) "The Worship of the Church and Prayer." The main idea is clearly that Christianity is an historical religion, and should be studied as such; and that it is still a practical and living thing. This foundation laid, it is possible for the Seniors to go on to learn about the Prophets, and about the Bible generally, and about Baptism and Holy Communion in detail, and about Discipleship. The analysis of the subjects in this part of the Syllabus deserves to be quoted in full:

First Year.	Third Year.
The Life of Our Lord.	The Life of Our Lord.
The Bible and what it is (O.T.).	The Bible and what it is (N.T.).
The Prophets.	The Prophets.
Holy Baptism.	St. Paul.
Discipleship.	Discipleship.
Second Year.	**Fourth Year.**
The Life of Our Lord.	The Life of Our Lord.
The Bible and what it is (O.T.).	The Bible and what it is ("The Canon").
The Prayer Book.	The Prophets.
The Early Church.	The Holy Communion.
Discipleship.	The Church of England.

The contrast with the Cambridgeshire Syllabus can be illustrated by reference to Course I., for Children of eleven to fourteen years (p. 28), where Section IV. is entitled "Old Testament (to be introduced at various points)," followed by a list of seven or eight names of Kings and Prophets.

Another feature of the Winchester Syllabus is its wide outlook. The elementary school-children of Cambridgeshire would only, towards the end of their schooldays, learn that Christianity did not cease with our Lord's Resurrection; two of the fourteen courses for children from eleven to fourteen years of age have to do with the Acts and St. Paul. But the children in the southern counties from the first day they go to school drink in the idea of Christianity as a continuous and living religion. The infants will tell you stories of St. Cuthbert and Bishop Patteson and Florence Nightingale, of St. Augustine and St. Vincent de Paul as well as of our Lord and His Apostles; the Juniors know of St. Swithun and Tyndale and John Keble as messengers of the Gospel in the same tradition as St. Paul;

the Seniors think of King Arthur and of *Pilgrim's Progress* as belonging to their Christian heritage. And this is to make history and literature as well as religion itself more interesting. It is to show Christ in His Church—that is to say, in His fulness. The alternative, presented in the Cambridgeshire Syllabus, is a patchwork, jejune and *famélique*, a faint copy of the richness of the Christian Gospel.

We have purposely mentioned only those features in the Winchester Syllabus which could perfectly well have found a place in the other, without transgressing the limits of outline which its compilers set themselves. For that reason we make no mention of the terse explanatory detail which illuminates the headings in the former; nor of its carefully planned references to modern manuals of religious teaching, so much more helpful than a mere bibliography; nor of its excellent courses on the Church's way of worship. What we wish to bring out is the difference of principle and *ethos* informing the two documents. In the Winchester case we feel all through the pastoral spirit, the coherent faith, the rational theology, the common experience of parson and teacher and child, which are precisely the things our Church schools exist to secure, and without which religious instruction is a vain thing. We miss these things in the Cambridgeshire Syllabus. There is fine literary acumen, a lively reverence for the Bible, and a recognition of the beauty of the life and mind and teaching of Jesus. But it is, in the worst sense of the word, academic. We cannot imagine a child growing up on this basis into the full stature of a Christian; though there is a danger lest its attractive form might lead teachers to be content with it, and to suppose that they were fulfilling their duty.

The Children's Bible and *The Little Children's Bible* need but little separate treatment. They are got up with all the artistry of which the Cambridge University Press is now a master. The arrangement of the passages from the Gospels illustrating the Life of our Lord is such as to make us doubly thankful for the Gospels as we have them. The Gospels are so much simpler, more intelligible, more direct. But this may be our conservatism. A far more fundamental objection affects the whole volume. Of its 280 pages nearly one-third is concerned with " The Story of the Lord Jesus "; and this is followed by the bulk of the book (pp. 87-240), which is entitled " The Story of His People." This does not mean, as we might suppose, the Christian people, but the Jewish people; and there

is not a passage from cover to cover to suggest that there is a Christian people, that Jesus left any Church to carry on His work, that His Life, in short, made any impress at all upon the world. A "Children's Bible" without a verse from the Acts of the Apostles and with only five snippets from St. Paul's Epistles is surely a contradiction in terms. Some would even say that it was nothing less than "to make the Word of God of none effect."

We have drawn attention to these experiments towards educational co-operation because they seem to us to exemplify very clearly what our Church schools stand for, and what care needs to be taken before any Concordat involving their surrender is accepted. They show, for example, the difference between a Syllabus which issues from the Church, and is subsequently modified for use in Council Schools,* and a Syllabus which is drawn up by an *ad hoc* Committee, even though it be a committee of the wise and learned. In the second case, we have a new religious authority called into being; and the result is such an attenuated body of teaching as we are accustomed to under the Cowper-Temple clause. It affords yet further indication, if any were needed, that in any educational reconstruction which may take place that clause must go. We are convinced that facilities in all schools for children to be brought up in the faith of their fathers represent the only principle on which a just and wise settlement can be built; and, if that principle were accepted, there would be room within it both for such grouping of schools as the Bishop of Manchester has suggested, and for such accommodation to the convictions of Nonconformists as the modified Winchester Syllabus embodies. We believe that there is a large and important area of common faith and religion between Nonconformists and Churchmen; but we are equally certain that only the Church can effectively express or guard it. No doubt the Church Assembly's newly appointed Education Commission will consider these things.

On one point the Cambridgeshire Committee is to be congratulated. It provides for the religious instruction of boys and girls between the ages of fourteen and eighteen. The presumption is surely justified that the present neglect of religious teaching in our Secondary Schools is a blot upon our educational system which cannot long be allowed to remain.

* We should state that the Winchester Syllabus on which these notes have been based is the original full edition; but its general basis is not affected by the omissions in the second version.

The Winchester Syllabus was intended for elementary schools only, and envisages no others. It is worth asking whether the committee responsible for it might not be reconstituted, and extend its labours on lines already proved so helpful, to cover the more advanced stages of education. We believe that the authorities of our public schools, no less than of the secondary schools, would welcome such a work with open arms.

Our overseas readers and all at home who think with them will find interest and encouragement in Canon Storr's recently published volume, *The Missionary Genius of the Bible.** Approaching the Bible from the modern historical standpoint, Canon Storr traces out for us the record which it gives of God's search for man, and shows how the faith in this His redemptive purpose is one of the strongest of the threads that bind the inspired Scriptures into one. With this in mind, it is natural that he should lay special emphasis on the element of universalism in Messianic prophecy; and we are not surprised that he should close his discussion of the Old Testament with a chapter on the Book of Jonah. In the chapters on the Gospels, Canon Storr finds helpful guidance in the writings of Dr. Hort, who is proving himself as time passes perhaps the most germinal thinker of the great Cambridge trio. Canon Storr's is the kind of book which makes the Bible more living; and teachers and preachers will find it of great value.

We cannot close these paragraphs without a word of comment on an event which later generations will surely single out as one of the great happenings of our age—the consecration of Liverpool Cathedral. Not only did the service, honoured as it was by the attendance of their Majesties, exhibit in rich and reverent solemnity the heart and mind of the Church of England; but the magnificent building, the still unfinished labour of twenty years, is a tribute to the living faith that inspires the Church-people of our time.

* Hodder and Stoughton, 3s. 6d. net.

EDUARD MEYER ON THE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY

MEYER'S three-volume work on the beginnings of Christianity* is a theological event of the first magnitude. The writer occupies a position similar to that of Mommsen a generation or more ago. Mommsen's short contributions towards theological research were eagerly studied, and are quoted still. But Meyer has written a book of over half a million words, dealing exhaustively with many of the vexed problems in New Testament study to-day. He comes to the subject with a vast knowledge of the Ancient East, as well as of Greece and Rome. The present Vice-Chancellor of Oxford in his recently published *Studies in Herodotus* describes him as " the greatest of all living writers on ancient history." His conclusions deserve the closest attention from theologians. They may feel that the limitations of the historical method prevent the truth being reached by that method only, but within the limitations of the method no such acute observer as Eduard Meyer is likely to arise in our generation.

I.

The volumes before us are marked by repetitions and other signs of haste, and the order is that in which the problems successively presented themselves to the mind of the writer rather than the logical order. He begins with Acts. This leads him back to St. Luke, St. Luke to St. Mark and its sources, which are discussed in the first volume. Finding himself among the first disciples, in order to explain their state of mind he traces the development of Judaism from the beginning of Persian rule to the opening of our era. This occupies the second volume, which ends with a brief sketch of the life of Christ. In the third volume he studies the second half of Acts, from which firm ground he explores the uncertainties of the first half; then, still ascending, he reaches the Resurrection. Finally he adopts the chronological order and discusses the development of the Church and in particular the careers of St. Peter and St. Paul. The method can easily be criticized, but it has many advantages, not the least of which is that the reader is impressed by the thoroughness of modern historical research. Not till half-way through the third volume are foundations sufficiently laid to enable building to begin. We all have our limitations, and readers will at once suspect Meyer's

* *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, vols. i. and ii., 1921; vol. iii., 1923. (Berlin: Cotta.)

when he avows that he has prepared himself for his task by reading the German theology of the last ten years, confident that whatever is valuable in previous discussion has found its way into these latest books (and, presumably, that English, French, and American writers can be safely neglected).

II.

However, this preoccupation with radical German criticism has had the satisfactory result of producing a healthy reaction. Meyer is continually exclaiming against the arbitrary methods of theologians, which cannot commend themselves to a historian. St. Luke, for instance, is in Meyer's eyes a historian, to be treated with the same respect as Polybius or Livy. His statements must be carefully examined, but, unless there is good reason to the contrary, we must accept them, as we should those of any other historian. The contrary procedure is ridiculous. So the Areopagus speech in Acts xvii. is a genuine report of Paul's speech at Athens. That the style is completely different from that of the Epistles does not matter. They are all addressed to believers; this is an example of how Paul preached to educated Gentiles. Some twelve years ago Norden made a sensation by his brilliant *Agnostos Theos*, which maintained that the speech was a favourite literary motif lifted by the author of Acts from other surroundings. Meyer has now brought Norden round to his view after many conversations, so that *Agnostos Theos* can now be neglected except as a storehouse of illustrative matter (iii. 92 *f.*). The visit to Jerusalem in Acts xviii. 22 ("And when he had landed at Cæsarea, he went up and saluted the Church, and went down to Antioch") is widely rejected. Either the whole journey is doubted or the Church is explained to be the Church of Cæsarea. But no historical fact is safe if this is allowed to pass without protest. Such arguments make discussion impossible (iii. 40).

A test case is Acts xxvii. 9-11, which verses Preuschen, Wellhausen, Wendland, and many others agree to strike out as an interpolation. They can be omitted without spoiling the narrative, and Paul's prophecy is suspicious. But, as Meyer says, on such principles every historical work can be declared worthless.* As if prophecy were not an every-day occurrence, and people were not always trusting to instinct rather than reason! We shall see later that Meyer himself is far more sceptical than is necessary, but for this protest

* On similar grounds the details of the siege of Platæa in Thucydides or the taking of Babylon by the Persians in Herodotus, were questioned by a now defunct race of historians (iii. 35).

against German methods (which English scholars have been making all the time) we are grateful. It is interesting to learn that part of Meyer's preparation for this work was a study of the founding and development of a living religion in our own times—namely, Mormonism.

III.

Meyer's treatment of St. Mark is most ingenious and interesting. This earliest Gospel was written after the Neronian persecution, and is a working over in Greek of the early Aramaic tales. Collections of the Lord's sayings and descriptions of His doings were made from the beginning. They were necessitated by the mission work which was at once inaugurated in Judæa and Galilee, and is reflected in the Instructions to the Twelve and the Seventy. St. Paul "received" these traditions at his conversion as authoritative records (*cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 25, etc.).* Mark therefore had a number of sources at his disposal, which can, without much difficulty, be distinguished.

1. First we isolate ch. xiii., the Apocalypse. Ostensibly it is addressed to the four disciples, in reality the recipients are the primitive Christians (note verse 14, "let him that readeth understand"). The style is markedly different from the rest of the Gospel; it is the only long discourse in St. Mark, and consists largely of Old Testament quotations, elsewhere little employed.

2. Next we note in vi. 30 to viii. 26 a number of doublets. Part of Jesus' itinerary seems to be told twice over. (This has often been noticed before. Knowing the fondness of Orientals for round numbers, we cannot but suspect that the stories of the Feeding of the 5,000 and the 4,000 refer to the same event, the number being slightly different according to two estimates.)

3. A Disciples-source can be distinguished, in which, except for Peter and, once or twice, the other leaders, those who surround Jesus are called vaguely "the disciples."

4. In another source the Twelve are frequently mentioned. We cannot follow Meyer as he picks out these two sources, but a few specimens of his criticism may be useful.

(*a*) iii. 13 *ff.* "And He goeth up into the mountain, and calleth unto Him whom He Himself would: and they went unto Him. 14. And He appointed twelve, *whom also He named apostles*, that they might be with Him, and that He might send them forth to preach, and to have authority to cast out devils. 16. *And He appointed the twelve*,† and Simon He sur-

* This position is radically different from the fashionable view, according to which the early disciples, expecting the Parousia to take place immediately, wrote down nothing.

† The *italicized* clauses are relegated to the appendix in R.V., in spite of their occurrence in ℵ and B.

named Peter." No writer, certainly not a sensible writer like Mark, would have written like this if his hands were not tied by written sources, which he must work in.

(*b*) vi. 6 *ff.* Verse 14 follows 6. Herod hears of Jesus going about from place to place. Verses 7-13 are an interpolation from the Twelve-source, which recurs in 30. In 31 we see the join, and the Disciples-source is resumed.

(*c*) iv. 10-20. 13 clearly follows 10 *a*, 11 and 12 being insertions from the Twelve-source. This is as plain as in the Hexateuch or in Livy. In verse 10 "His companions (*οἱ περὶ αὐτόν*) *with the twelve* asked of Him the parable." *With the twelve* is unnecessary here, and is taken from the same source as 11 and 12. This solution, by the way, removes the well-known difficulty of these words, which completely contradict the obvious purpose of the parables—namely, to teach.

5. Finally we have Peter's reminiscences, which are authentic, and are worked by Mark into the Disciples-source.

Meyer's conclusion is that Mark's Gospel is a most valuable historical record. The sources he used take us right back into the earliest days.

Similar criticism is applied to Matthew and Luke, but we cannot summarize it here. An important contention is that Q and Mark are both sections of the same tradition; neither is dependent on the other. The various sources are arranged in the following order:

1 (oldest of all). The Peter reminiscences and the Disciples-source. This already incorporated different versions of the same events.

2. The Twelve-source, which took shape in Jerusalem after Peter had left Jerusalem.*

3. The special Lukan-source.

4. The Logia (Q.).

5. The special Matthew-source.

6. Mark xiii.

Matthew and Luke were written in the Flavian period, probably in the eighties, but their main sources were much earlier. Mark xiii. dates from 60 or a little later.

IV.

The first 419 pages of the second volume describe the development of the state of things into which Jesus was born. This sketch of 300 years of Jewish history is of quite extraordinary value. Meyer views unsympathetically the triumph of fanaticism in the Maccabæan wars, and certainly it prepared the

* See below for Meyer's account of the Twelve.

way for the catastrophe of A.D. 70. A brief life of Jesus concludes this volume. He was a native of Galilee—that is to say, a district devoted to the law, where Pharisaism ruled supreme. His conception of the world was Pharisaic, as regards the Kingdom of God, the spirit world of good angels and demons, the Resurrection, and the coming Judgment. With the Pharisees He believed that the kingdom would introduce blessings for all nations, as indeed the prophets had taught. But His inner attitude to the Law, and His conception of the soul's relation to God, were completely different from theirs.

Jesus was not the Founder of Christianity regarded as a new religion. The ascended Christ may be called the Founder, but not Jesus of Nazareth. He was the fulfiller of the promises and the law, the divine teacher, the bringer-out of the meaning enshrined in God's revelation from the beginning—and in this sense the Messiah. The popular idea of the Messiah was in His eyes Satanic (Mk. viii. 33). He was not the Son of David (Mk. xii. 17)—by His "render to Cæsar," etc., He transcended national religion. Rather He was the Danielic Son of Man. Christianity was founded on the conviction that Jesus was on the right hand of God, and would come again as world-regent. But did He Himself hold this belief? Why not? asks Meyer, pointing out that modern prepossessions have led scholars astray in their judgment of Jesus.

Lastly, Jesus held Himself to be the Son of God, not in any metaphysical sense, but in virtue of His inner unity with God and utter devotion to His will. And this Jesus left such an impression on His followers as gave them no peace till they set out to win the world.

V.

We now come to Meyer's refreshingly conservative study of Acts. He agrees with most recent writers in making the prologue to the Gospel cover both parts of the joint work. Theophilus is an educated Christian, to whom the book is dedicated after the current literary fashion. It is intended for the Christian community, and the dedication shows that it was formally published. Meyer has scant mercy for such aberrations as that of Blass and Zahn, who suppose two editions of the Lukan writings, one of which is represented by the Western Text (i. 1-9).* In writing his book Luke was influenced by stylistic considerations, but so are modern historians. The Septuagint is far the most potent of his literary models. He writes history in the style of the popular tale, much as Herodotus does.

* What follows is derived from vol. iii.

Unfortunately the two parts of his book have been rudely sundered. The clumsy interpolation at the beginning of Acts is an attempt to remedy the loss of the first part.* No other interpolations can be proved. Indeed, the absence of additions in ch. xxviii. recounting Paul's death is strong evidence that the book has come down to us practically as it left Luke's pen. A striking example, showing that the Gospel and the Acts form one book in two parts, is provided by Luke xxiv., where in defiance of tradition the writer has brought all the Resurrection appearances to Jerusalem in order to prepare for Acts i. Like all other historians, Luke has unexplained silences; certain things are omitted merely because the historian thinks they are not necessary to explain the course of events.

Luke joined Paul at Troas (Acts xvi. 10) and remained at Philippi, where he was picked up on the last journey to Jerusalem (xx. 5).† From the source point of view the whole of Acts falls into two parts: (*a*) xvi. 6-21, xx. 4 to xxviii. 31, which are all "we-sections," derived from personal observation, and (*b*) all the rest, for which Luke was dependent on investigation.

The origin of (*b*) is a comparatively simple problem. The stories, in so far as they are not derived from Paul himself, concern Peter, Barnabas, John Mark, Stephen, and Philip. Mark, whom he knew in Rome (Col. iv. 10, 14), told him about Peter, to whom he had been interpreter; about Barnabas his cousin; and about the affairs of the Church at Jerusalem, which had largely centred round his mother's house. In the person of Mark the divisions between Petrine and Pauline conceptions of the Gospel were healed, so Luke's tendency to minimize differences is explained. The stories about Philip came from his own lips at Cæsarea (xxi. 8). The Stephen story is quite different from the rest, and with various details was gathered by Luke in Palestine. But the story of Pentecost in its present form is due to Luke himself. It was written down at a time when the Glossolalia of the original tale had become unintelligible to the Christian public and a different treatment was necessary. The sources being so satisfactorily accounted for, the historical value of the records ranks accordingly high. The famine foretold by Agabus is historical. Luke's account of the death of Herod is "at least as trustworthy as that of Josephus" (iii. 168). The account of Philip's experiences strikes some as legendary, but this is how Philip remembered them twenty-five years later, and with all honesty told Luke. The purpose of the Simon Magus story is to show how the Simonians, a dangerous

* A similar explanation will account for the textual phenomena of Luke xxiv.

† No simple reader could miss this, but learned writers have resorted to every imaginable shift to avoid the obvious.

rival to the Church when Luke wrote, were overcome in the person of their founder. The Apostolic Council is accurately described in Acts xv. Galatians ii. refers to the same events, but is an *ex parte* statement written ten years later in great excitement to readers who were primed with the views of Paul's opponents. The historian finds no difficulty in deciding which account to follow. On theological grounds theologians have judged that Paul must always be right. Historically considered—well, what history could be written on the basis of preferring Napoleon's ideal picture of himself to that drawn by others?

VI.

If the Acts record the Beginnings of Christianity, a still more fundamental problem lies behind them, its actual origin. Meyer's treatment of it deserves very careful study. The earliest *Credo* (the most primitive document of all, taking us back to the very beginning) is found in 1 Cor. xv. 3-5, the tradition which St. Paul received on his conversion, and may well have known even before.

"That Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that He was buried; and that He hath been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures; and that He appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve."

Here the *Credo* ended. We must draw a line somewhere in verses 3-8, for "last of all . . . He appeared to me also" cannot be part of the tradition. Verses 6 and 7 are suspicious, because "to all the apostles" is apparently a doublet of "to the twelve." We conclude that the *Credo* ends with τοῖς δώδεκα, where the ὅτι clause also ends. The rest is St. Paul's addition.

"Then He appeared to above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain until now, but some are fallen asleep." This is an earlier tradition of the story of Pentecost. "Then He appeared to James; then to all the apostles." Visiting Jerusalem when James ruled the Church, Paul heard tell that the Lord had appeared first to James, then to the twelve or the whole body of apostles. This is a parallel story to that contained in the *Credo*, only with James's name substituted for Peter's.

The historical data are scanty. The actors in these scenes construed the events as God's supernatural working, not as material for criticism. But two fundamental facts emerge from St. Paul and the Gospels. (i) The disciples, as opposed to the Galilæan women who stayed, fled to Galilee.* The

* Luke completely remodelled the tradition by locating all the appearances in Jerusalem.

early Church comforted itself by reflecting that the predictions of the Old Testament and of Jesus were fulfilled thereby. (ii) The Church began its life at Jerusalem, where Peter and the rest had returned. The link between these two facts is the command to seek the Risen Lord in Galilee.*

We may reconstruct the course of events thus. The disciples fled in terror at the Crucifixion. Peter especially brooded over the recent past—his confession, the Transfiguration, his denial, all of which are historical. Then he saw Jesus again. The experience of the Transfiguration was repeated.† He realized that all was not at an end. The kingdom foretold in Scripture would be set up, and the Son of Man of whom Daniel wrote would return to reign. The Twelve had been promised that they should be rulers in the Kingdom. (By appointing Twelve Jesus had provided for the coming kingdom and had virtually claimed to be Messiah.) Only from Jerusalem as a centre was this possible. Confirmed in their purpose by a second appearance they returned to Jerusalem. They filled the gap in their number—the Matthias story is undoubtedly historical—and began to preach. Their message was the teaching of Jesus with the added *good news* that Jesus is Messiah and Lord‡ (Acts ii. 36). Almost immediately they underwent, in company with many others,§ a great psychical experience, a "collective hallucination" as we may call it, without offence. The extraordinary conduct of the Twelve can only be explained by the overpowering influence of the personality of Jesus.

Only those who are familiar with radical criticism can appreciate the significance of Meyer's arguments. Perhaps this is as far as history can ever go with its present methods. Perhaps a detached observer during those momentous weeks, seeing only the exterior occurrences and missing their interior significance, would have described them somewhat as Meyer does. It is not the duty of a historian to bring in God at this stage and say here and now did the Almighty reveal Himself. But Meyer's reconstruction clamours for God. Without God

* Mk. xvi. 8. How perplexed the tradition was is shown by the contradiction in Mark—"tell His disciples and Peter" (7), "they said nothing to any one" (8). Meyer says little about the empty tomb, but seems to regard it as the inevitable expression of a belief in the Resurrection—at least for Pharisees and Christians. Greeks would not have found it necessary (iii. 212).

† Meyer contrasts the clear outlines of the Transfiguration tradition with the vagueness and contradictions of the Resurrection story.

‡ Jesus was *Maran* (κύριος) from the first. The whole of Bousset's argument in *Kyrios Christos*, that the title "Lord" grew up in the "primitive Gentile-Christian Community" of Antioch ("which never existed"), is dismissed as perverse and erroneous. Prof. Lake's reconstruction of primitive Christianity is also largely based on this assumed Antiochian stage, which is pure speculation; there is no evidence.

§ *Cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 6.

there is no *vera causa*. We are confident that sooner or later either Meyer himself, or one trained in Meyer's school, will dare to wed theology to history, and acknowledge the supreme miracle of world-history.

VII.

The next section, dealing with the growth of the community at Jerusalem, must be hurried over. The moment Jesus was acknowledged as Messiah and coming world-ruler, then all the ideas which had developed in Judaism since Daniel were transferred to Him. He was Son of Man, Son of God, Saviour. Theology was as yet in the future; there was no logical thinking out of the relations of Father and Son, and it was left to St. Paul to assign pre-existence and a share in Creation to Christ.* The solemn evening meals eaten with Jesus were continued. They took on an eschatological significance and became cult-acts, in accordance with the widespread conception of holy meals as establishing communion with one another and with God. Baptism, fasting, and formal prayers, all taken over from the Baptist's disciples (*cf.* Luke xi. 1), are presupposed. There is no hard and fast organization, but the Church follows lines at once hierarchical and representative: hierarchical, for the Twelve are on one side as rulers of the coming kingdom; representative, for over against them is the assembly of Christians, from whom are chosen *elders* as councillors and *deacons* to serve in things spiritual as well as material.

In other words, Meyer repeats what is practically a consensus of contemporary Continental scholarship, that the Church was Catholic from the first.

VIII.

Perhaps the most notable part of the book is the treatment of the relations of SS. Peter and Paul. We can only give a brief summary of the brilliant account of St. Paul. Here again Meyer protests against current theories. Paul was essentially a Jew with a tincture of Greek culture. Resemblances in his Epistles to the Stoics or the Cynic preachers are quite external, due to the common human needs of a generation which had reached the same stage of civilization. In no sense did Hellenism enter the Church with Paul. The Greeks and he were poles apart. For the Greek wise man morality was a task, for Paul it was a gift from God. The Greek aimed at a dignified philosophy, independence, and freedom in this life;

* Perhaps so, but his expositions were accepted by the Church as true. All his words and actions were closely watched. What a chance he would have offered to his opponents if his doctrines had been innovations!

for the Christian happiness lies in the *Jenseits*.* Greek philosophy was a movement from above, an emancipation from popular religions. Christianity, historically considered, came from below. It lived in an unphilosophical world of miracle, magic, and demonology. It was one of the new religions of the imperial period, and represents "the reaction of the lower classes and the East against the dominion of the educated and of Hellenism" (iii. 326). As to the mystery religions, they moved on lines parallel to Christianity, and were much influenced by it; the Christian σωτηρία has its roots not in Hellenism, but in the Old Testament.

Meyer believes that the split at Antioch between Peter and Paul was not bridged in their lifetime. The Judaisers of Galatians maintained that Jesus was the Jewish Messiah, come not to take away, but to fulfil the law. The Gospel was for all, but they must enter the new Israel by circumcision. Paul's claim to authority was fallacious, for he had learned all from the older disciples. The leader of this movement must have been Peter. The fierceness of Paul's attack in Galatians suggests this, and it is hard to explain the quick change of the Galatian converts except by the influence of Peter, the rock. The influence of James and the Jerusalem hotheads will have impelled Peter to this course.† The controversy continued to the end. "How it can have been doubted that Peter came to Corinth in person is one of those things which are incomprehensible to me" (iii. 441). He stands in 1 Cor. i. 12, iii. 22, on precisely the same footing as Paul and Apollos. To whom can the ὑπερλίαν apostles of 2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11 refer unless to Peter? In 2 Corinthians the fight is very bitter. Luke, writing after the Neronian persecution, covers it up, but to make Peter disappear after Acts xii. is the only way of doing it.

The Roman Church was probably founded in A.D. 49. The disturbances mentioned by Suetonius were caused by the introduction of the Gospel.‡ The founders were Jewish Christians who followed the lead of James and Peter. Paul writes to a Jewish church (Rom. vii. 1) with a Gentile fringe (see i. 16, ii. 9, 10). The Epistle is a diplomatic masterpiece. Notice the way in which he introduces the Spanish journey, to show that he will be merely passing through Rome—he has no wish to intrude on another man's ground. But in ch. xvi. (which is, of course, authentic) he proves that he has many

* But did not the Fourth Gospel with its doctrine of eternal life reconcile the two conceptions?

† I have not noticed that Meyer makes the point, but Peter's justification is clear. He would have looked upon uncircumcised Gentile Christians an as outer fringe corresponding to the "Godfearers" who surrounded the synagogues.

‡ *Claud.* 25. Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit; *cf.* Acts xviii. 2.

friends and adherents there. In Acts xxviii. Luke brings Paul to Rome. He arrived in the spring of 62,* and was executed in the persecution of 64. Peter, being too old to make sport of, was crucified. Paul, as a Roman citizen, was put to death with the sword. The crime of which both were guilty was "the name." The Government, after careful investigation, came to the conclusion that the Christians were distinct from the Jews, and an unlawful association. From Phil. i. 15-20 we learn that the oppositions which Paul had tried to bridge were still there, even increased by his presence. Christians were not living in harmless simplicity; rather they were a revolutionary force which disturbed the capital. The breach is still more evident in Col. iv. 10. Three only of those to whom Paul wrote in Romans are on his side. One of these was Mark. If Mark was in Rome, then Peter was there too. "To reject the witness of Papias is purely arbitrary. In the case of a Greek writer it would have occurred to no one to doubt it" (iii. 497). When and how Peter came there is no evidence to show. In all probability he was there when Paul arrived.

The Judaisers were fighting a forlorn hope. Mark's defection was the precursor of many others. When the storm was over he reconciled the two parties. The martyrdom of the leaders stilled this particular controversy, but Paulinism won. The decisive blow was the execution of James in 62. His successor, Simeon son of Clopas, had no authority for Gentile Christians.

We cannot discuss Meyer's argument here, but one remark suggests itself. Party feeling in Rome was clearly very strong, but St. Paul does not mention St. Peter in the Captivity Epistles. He has no hesitation in naming him in Galatians, and in writing Philippians he is equally moved. Does not this suggest that St. Peter was occupying a mediating position, mistrusted by the hotheads on both sides, but that St. Paul scrupulously refrains from identifying him with those who probably used his name?

IX.

Much has been left out in this rapid sketch, but enough has been said, I hope, to induce the reader to buy the books. Before concluding my review I should like to mention some very important remarks, which, coming from an author so qualified to make them, deserve careful attention.

After the frightful misgovernment of the Roman republic the Empire gave order and security again. But it was of a material kind, and benefited the well-to-do; the masses profited little or nothing. They were prepared for Christianity by the

* The Chronology of the N.T. is very carefully worked out.

form which Hellenistic and Roman civilization had reached: "We are not concerned with the Hellenization of the new religion which had emerged from Judaism, but with the progressive Orientalizing of the whole civilization which had grown out of the soil of Greek culture" (iii. 334). Philosophy responded to the spirit of the age and in Neoplatonism became a mystic-theosophist movement. The final result was that the ancient world, which formerly left the individual conscience to itself so long as the protecting deities of the city were acknowledged, now became a Church demanding belief from all. Most important of all, the educated classes lost the leadership, and the non-rational and instinctive ideas of the masses prevailed. In this judgment we hear an echo of the great controversy which has been raging in Germany round Spengler's *Downfall of the West*. Some observers see a beginning of the same process in the social tendencies of to-day. Looking back on the developments so vividly described by Meyer, as Christians and humanists we are not concerned to maintain that the early Church saved for posterity all that could be saved of educated classical antiquity.

W. K. L. Clarke.

THE ELIZABETHAN PULPIT

It is remarkable, in consideration of the vast amount of work which has been spent upon the various aspects of Elizabethan literature, that so little attention has been paid to this particular phase of it—a phase which has its full share of the Elizabethan richness and piquancy. Granted that it is a field for the gleaner, not the reaper, and that it has perhaps more than its share of elaborate dullness—at least for a later age which has lost the taste for theological subtleties—still, it will be found barren neither of pleasure nor interest.

A Londoner born about 1530, with a predisposition to sermons, would, if he lived to be a hundred years old, have heard all the preachers with whom I propose to deal in this article. As a youth of fourteen he would have heard Latimer's Sermon on the Plough, and as a nonagenarian he would have listened to John Donne; and he would have lived during the golden age of preaching in England. His father would have tales of Fisher and Colet, his children would know the eloquence and poetry of Jeremy Taylor, but his grandfathers in the fifteenth century and his grandchildren in the eighteenth would know nothing of the sort, unless by the merest exception.

The fifteenth century has been unnecessarily maligned, but

it is undeniable that it produced neither quantity nor quality of work comparable to the Elizabethan harvest; and this is especially true in regard to sermons and other theological and devotional writings. What was written was written in Latin; even sermons delivered in English were translated into Latin for publication. Wyclif, it is true, left sermons, and Reginald Pecock a long theological treatise in English, but Latin remained the general rule for published works until Fisher's time, if not later.

The changing of the old order was only a phase of the Renascence and the Reformation, working together in a matter where religion and literature joined hands; but the conditions which determined the nature of the new order were largely political. The decay of preaching had been, in the first instance, a result rather of the interference of the State in matters of religion, sometimes in one interest, sometimes in another, than of any inherent decadence in the spiritual estate. Preaching had been, indeed, from the first a tradition in the Church, and the Middle Ages had kept it alive in the work of such men as St. Bernard. But a new religious movement must necessarily give an impulse to preaching, from the instinct of self-explanation, and the definite separation of the English Church from the Bishop of Rome gave rise to a whole literature of apologetics, spoken and written. Even up to the time of Donne, preachers concerned themselves with refutations of Roman doctrines and usages, though in a manner more and more impersonal, as the reformed Church found its self-sufficiency. It is primarily to this motive that we owe the work of the great sixteenth-century preachers and theologians.

To begin with Latimer, in a survey of their work, is purely arbitrary and not very defensible, in view of the greatness of his two great predecessors, Fisher and Colet. But for purposes of conciseness, and as being interested in preaching as a phase of the Elizabethan age, rather than in itself, I shall pass over their work as briefly as possible. It began with the first years of the new century, when Fisher was elevated to the See of Rochester and preached a course of sermons on the Penitential Psalms, and Colet denounced the moral abuses of the Church before the Convocation. Of the two, Fisher belongs to the old school, Colet to the new, though Fisher makes the better reading. He was a conscious artist in language, and his faults of style are chargeable to his instrument rather than to his skill. Colet, with perhaps as much art, but certainly with less imagination and poetry, displays more fondness for critical exposition of Scripture, and more enthusiasm in reform.

Latimer combines something of both, and adds not a little of

his own. Born in the closing years of the old century, of yeoman stock, educated at Cambridge, appointed as one of the first twelve itinerant preachers of Cambridge, under the bull obtained by Fisher as vice-chancellor, Latimer lived a long, active, and exciting life until his martyrdom in 1555. His fortunes rose and fell with the changes of State policy in matters of religion, and he was imprisoned numberless times on charges of heresy. Sometimes he recanted, sometimes a more favourable party came into power and secured his release; and through it all he preached—at Paul's Cross, at Court, at the Spital, at the Shrouds when the weather was bad. In the churchwardens' accounts of St. Margaret's, Westminster, there is a record of money paid for " the mending of divers pews that were broken when Dr. Latimer did preach," and this is only one of many testimonies that his preaching was highly exciting and popular. It is not hard to understand, if one reads his sermons with an imaginative background of the times and conditions under which they were delivered.

The most noteworthy quality in Latimer is his sense of humour. It never failed him. His sermons abound in puns and jokes and quaintly humorous ways of putting things. He called the image of the Virgin in his cathedral " our old Sibyl," and had her burned with her sisters, old and young; he declared himself willing to preach or " to play the fool " at the execution of Forest, a condemned heretic; he is said to have skipped about for joy on resigning his bishopric; and there is a grim quaintness in his last words at the stake: " Be of good comfort, Master Ridley; we shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out."

There are extant about forty of Latimer's sermons, of which the greater number belong to his old age, when he was " a sore, bruised man," over three score and seven, yet " most assiduous in preaching, generally delivering two sermons each Sunday, and rising every morning, winter and summer, at two o'clock to study." The most famous of these sermons are the Sermons on the Card, the Convocation Sermon, and the Sermon on the Plough, and these three are fairly representative of Latimer's power. Of the first we have nothing complete, but only " the tenour and effect of certain Sermons made by Master Latimer in Cambridge about the year of our Lord 1529, and they are chiefly famous for the novel comparison of the business of salvation to a game of cards. Latimer exhorted his hearers to " play trumps " by declaring for Christ and his Church, and he sounded the first notes of that denunciatory trumpet that he later blared in the face of the King himself.

The sermon preached to the Convocation in 1536 was written

and delivered in Latin, but there can be little doubt that the English in which we have it is Latimer's own. It is a more carefully planned composition than is usual with him, but its righteous indignation over clerical abuses is no less unflinching and unmistakable, and it shows a good deal of conscious artistry in phrase and simile.

It makes the easy, conversational, racy style of his later sermons all the more notable when we see, as here, that he was capable of sustained oratory and dignified phraseology.

It is upon those later sermons that Latimer's literary immortality rests, and rests secure. Without any taste for the theological intricacies which trouble "curious brains," and without any affectation of patristic learning, Latimer succeeded in writing sermons for his audience at Paul's Cross which are still as delightful to read as they must have been then to hear. On every page there is something piquant and unexpected: "A pretty story of a friar to refresh you withal," a resounding epithet that recalls to one's mind the Marprelate pamphleteers or the comedies of Dekker—"pot-gospellers," "flibberjibs," "ye brain-sick fools, ye hoddy-peeks, ye doddy-pols, ye huddles"; a daring colloquialism, as when the Pharisees are represented as saying to Christ, "Master, we know that thou art Tom Truth"; a pointed personality—"He that took the silver basin and ewer for a bribe thinketh it will never come out; but he may now know that I know it"; a description like that of Faith as "a noble duchess with her gentleman usher going before her, and a train after her"; or a dramatic contrast, such as between dead images covered with silk and gold, and "Christ's faithful and lively images an-hungred, athirst, acold."

Between Latimer and Bernard Gilpin, who is the next great name in the annals of the sixteenth-century preaching, there are three less notable men who deserve not to be quite forgotten: Bishop Hooper, Latimer's successor as Court preacher, John Bradford, his fellow martyr, and Thomas Lever, master of St. John's College, Cambridge, and the greatest of these was Lever. He lived far on into Elizabeth's reign, and carried on the traditions of Latimer in the matters of invective and broad humour, but he has a tiresome habit of grouping words in triplets—"From whence shall we that be governors, kepers, and feders, bye and provide with our own costes, labor, and diligence, bread, foode, and necessaryes," etc.

Gilpin, too, was a disciple of Latimer; he is endeared to the student by the fact that he has left but one sermon, and that a good one. It was preached before Edward VI. in 1552, when the King was absent—if I may be pardoned the Irishism.

Its subject-matter is not new—a scathing denunciation of farmed livings and non-resident priests, of legal abuses and of the decay of preaching. "A thousand pulpits in England are covered with dust. Some have not had four sermons these fifteen or sixteen years, since friars left their limitations, and a fewe of those were worthie the name of sermons." Nor was the style very different from Latimer's, though it lacked his humour. It is the perfection of its simplicity that makes Gilpin's Court sermon perhaps the best example of pulpit oratory before Elizabeth's reign.

With that reign began a new period of comparative quiescence in politics and religion, and a corresponding increase in artistic and intellectual activity, of all kinds. The English Church found new problems to deal with in the rise of the nonconformist sects, and new opportunities in the revival of popular interest in preaching. Izaak Walton, in his life of Hooker, the greatest preacher of the new régime, has an interesting passage on the religious conditions in Elizabeth's time, when "the many pretended titles to the Crown, the frequent Treasons, the Doubts of her Successor, the late Civil War, and the Sharp Persecution that had raged to the effusion of so much Blood in the Reign of Queen Mary, were fresh in the memory of all men. . . . But Time, and Peace, and Plenty, begot Self-ends; and those begot Animosities, Envy, Opposition, and Unthankfulness for those blessings for which they lately thirsted; being then the very utmost of their Desires, and even beyond their Hopes. . . . For those very people that had enjoyed the desires of their hearts in a Reformation from the Church of Rome became at last so like the Grave, as never to be satisfied; but were still thirsting for more and more; neglecting to pay that Obedience to Governments and perform those Vows to God, which they made in their days of Adversities and Fear: so that in short time there appeared three several interests, each of them fearless and restless in the prosecution of their Designs; they may for distinction be called the active Romanists, the restless Non-Conformists (of which there were many sorts), and the passive, peaceable Protestant. The Counsels of the first considered and resolved on in Rome; the second in Scotland, in Geneva, and in divers selected, secret, dangerous Conventicles, both there, and within the bosom of our own Nation; the third pleaded and defended their cause by Establisht Laws, both Ecclesiastical and Civil; and if they were active it was to prevent the other two from destroying what was by those known Laws happily establisht to them and their Posterity."

Walton goes on to say all the uncomplimentary things he

can think of about the Non-Conformists, both in England and Scotland, and quotes a letter written by an " ingenious Italian, who, being about this time come newly into this Nation, writ scoffingly to a Friend in his own Countrey, ' that the common people of England were wiser than the wisest of his Nation; for here the very Women and Shop-keepers were able to judge of Predestination, and determine what Laws were fit to be made concerning Church Government; then, what were fit to be obeyed or abolished. That they were more able (or at least thought so) to raise and determine perplexed Cases of Conscience, than the most Learned Colledges in Italy. That Men of the slightest Learning, and the most ignorant of the common people, were mad for a new, or Super- or Re-Reformation of Religion; and that in this they appeared like that man, who would never cease to whet, and whet his knife, till there was no steel left to make it useful.' And ' that those very Men that were most busie in Oppositions, and Disputations, and Controversies, and finding out the faults of their Governors, had usually the least of Humility and Mortification, or of the Power of Godliness.' "

And then, with a final fling at the Atheists, Walton leads his digression to an account of Archbishop Whitgift. He was a remarkable man, and advisor to the Queen, who called him her " little black husband," and consulted him in matters of importance. He became engaged in a controversy with one Thomas Cartwright, a violent Non-Conformist, and they had a very bad-tempered flyting. Whitgift had the last word, in his " Defense of the Answer to the Admonition against the Reply of T. C." Buried in the mass of theological hair-splitting, there are occasional gleams of humour, never intentional. For instance, Whitgift had said that one learned sermon was better than many unlearned, and that frivolous and contentious sermons " seldom or never work any good effect; many women in London could on that sort occupy their time." Cartwright pounced upon this, and accused Whitgift of disparagement of the good women of London, eliciting from the latter a defence which amounted to an apology: " Touching the women of London, I have not said anything to their dispraise. I know a number very honest and godly, and I know none that is evil. Only I require that modesty in some of them that beseemeth sober matrons and women professing the Gospel. It is not seemly for a woman to speak in the Church, no not that which is good; much less comely is it for her to scold openly in the streets, or to be a common depraver of others at tables and other meetings."

Another great divine of the same period was Bishop Jewel,

who wrote sermons and an *Apologia pro Ecclesia Anglicana*. He preached to the Queen, and his sermons show the new spirit which characterized her Court. For the rough-and-ready eloquence of Latimer, Jewel substituted learning, classical and patristic, and minute analysis of texts and doctrines. No less vehement than his predecessors in denouncing abuses, Jewel advocated as a remedy the "maintenance of learning whereby an able and efficient ministry may grow." That he could be eloquent, too, upon occasion, a short quotation will show. It is taken from the peroration of a sermon against the decay of learning:

"O good my Lords and brethren, I come not hither to be a patron for money matters. God seeth my heart before whom I speak it. But I see God's temple by this means forsaken. Young men, such as are of most towardness turn themselves to be physicians or men of Law; yea, Clerks or Apothecaries. The matter is so used, that they are ashamed to be ministers in God's church. They should not so do, say you? No, neither yet you, as your doings are, can be angry with them. They are not angels, but your own children, your brethren, your cousins, of your own affections, of your own flesh and blood, and they think themselves too good to become your slaves. O merciful God, at the beginning of the Gospel, every man brought his goods, and laid them at the feet of the Disciples. Now every man is ready to pull out, in a manner, necessary sustenance, even out of the mouths of Christ's disciples. . . . In the mean season, the poor universities are neglected, the schools everywhere unfurnished, the youth driven and chased away from the building."

Hooker is best known to us, and rightly, as the author of the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, one of the greatest monuments of English prose. But he wrote several sermons and preached probably many more. Concerning the sermon "of the Certainty and Perpetuity of Faith in the Elect," Coleridge wrote: "I can remember no other discourse that sinks into and draws up comfort from the depths of our being below our own distinct consciousness, with the clearness and godly loving-kindness of the truly evangelical and God-to-be-thanked-for sermon." And Walton writes, in his life of Hooker: "His sermons were neither long nor earnest, but uttered with a grave zeal and an humble voice; his eyes always fixt on one place, to prevent his imagination from wandering, insomuch that he seemed to study as he spoke; the design of his Sermons (as indeed of all his Discourses) was to show Reasons for what he spake, and with these reasons such a kind of rhetoric, as did rather convince and persuade, than frighten men into piety. Studying not much

for matter (which he never wanted) as for apt illustrations to inform and teach his unlearned hearers by familiar examples, and then make them better by convincing applications; never laboring by hard words, and then needless distinctions and subdivisions to amuse his hearers, and get glory to himself; but glory only to God. Which intention, he would often say, was as discernible in a preacher, as an artificial from a natural beauty."

The most noticeable thing about Hooker is his tolerance for doubt and difference of opinion. He could say, and openly, "The Church of Rome is a true Church of Christ and a sanctified Church." His line of reasoning is always carefully thought out, and his language unfailingly dignified. He used, but not abused, his vast stores of erudition. It is plain that his audience is not the audience of earlier days, but one appreciative of culture, style, and broad-mindedness. Yet Hooker was not an unpopular preacher, and was Master of the Temple when he was thirty (that is, in 1585). It was there that he became engaged in the theological debate with Travers, which gave rise in the end to the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. Hooker disliked the noise of London, however, and was removed to a country parsonage—at his own request. There he finished his great work, and wrote several minor ones.

No short extract can do justice to Hooker's style; he rarely descends to the rhetorical. But I will read a paragraph from one of his sermons on St. Jude:

"To make a wicked and a sinful man most holy through his believing is more than to create a world of nothing. Our faith most holy! Surely, Solomon could not shew the Queen of Sheba, so much treasure in all his kingdom, as is lapt up in these words. O that our hearts were stretched out like tents, and that the eyes of our understanding were as bright as the sun, that we might thoroughly know the riches of the glorious inheritance of the Saints, and what is the exceeding greatness of his towards us, whom he accepteth for pure, and most holy, through our believing. O that the Spirit of the Lord would give this doctrine entrance into the stony and brazen heart of the Jew, which followeth the Law of Righteousness, but cannot attain unto the righteousness of the Law! . . . O that God would cast down the eyes of the proud, and humble the souls of the high-minded! that they might at the length abhor the garments of their own flesh, which cannot hide their nakedness, and put on the faith of Christ Jesus. . . . O that God would open the Ark of Mercy, wherein this Doctrine lyeth, and set it wide before the eyes of poor afflicted consciences, which fly up and down upon the water of their afflictions, and can see

nothing but only the gulf and deluge of their sins, wherein there is no place for them to rest their feet. The God of pity and compassion give you all strength and courage, every day, and every hour, and every moment, to build and edify yourselves in this most pure and holy faith."

While Hooker was Master of the Temple, Henrie Smith was elected Lecturer of St. Clement Danes. He was perhaps even more popular as a preacher than Hooker, and was generally known as Silver-tongued Smith. Nashe in *Pierce Penniless* says that, before entering into the "wonderful ways" of theology, Smith "refined, prepared, and purified his wings with sweet poetry." Nothing of it remains, however, and not many sermons, which he committed to writing, "because sickness hath restrained me from preaching." There are many testimonies to his unbounded popularity. Wood says he was "esteemed the miracle and wonder of his age, for his prodigious memory, and for his fluent, eloquent, and practical way of preaching." And Fuller says that people of quality "brought their own pues with them"—that is, their legs to stand upon in the allies.

Smith is something of a reactionary in his insistence on simplicity in preaching. "Wheat is good," he writes, quoting Amos, "but they which sell the refuse of it are reproved. So preaching is good, but this refuse of preaching is but like swearing; for one takes the name of God in vain, and the other takes the Word of God in vain. As every sound is not music, so every sermon is not preaching, but worse than if he should read a homily. It is harder to speak God's word than to speak of God, yet there are preachers lately risen up, which shroud every absurd sermon under the name of simple teaching, like the Popish Priests."

With the coming of the Stuarts there was another change in the methods of preaching, a change which threatened to be a decadence. James I., who was even more of a dilletante in religious and literary matters than Henry VIII., set the fashion by showing himself interested in the most ingenious theological disputations. Sermon-hearing became the vogue in his Court, and the sermon began to assume a disproportionate importance in the service. Bishop Andrewes himself, the greatest Jacobean preacher except Donne, lamented this state of things when he said of Ezekiel's contemporaries, "they seemed to reckon of sermons no otherwise than of songs to give them the hearing, to commend the air of them, and so let them go. The music of a song, and the rhetoric of a sermon, all is one."

But it cannot be denied that Andrewes himself yielded to the demand for pedantry, and that his sermons have little

charm, for all their erudition and ingenuity. He was greater as a prelate and author than as a preacher; he took part in the Hampton Court Conference, was one of the authorized translators of 1611, wrote several theological works, and enjoyed the friendship of the most famous of his contemporaries, such as Bacon and Casaubon. His learning was unequalled; he was thoroughly conversant with fifteen languages, and it is said that the awe of his presence restrained James from unseemly levity.

His sermons, ninety-six in number, were printed posthumously, by special command of Charles I., who was "graciously pleased to think a paper-life better than none," "though they could not live with all that elegancy which they had upon his tongue." They are annoying; he indulges in so many divisions and subdivisions and minute examinations of words, one at a time, that the reader is hopelessly entangled. It is all a marvellous display of learning and exegetical skill, but it lacks point. His humour is not much better, if this is a typical example:

"If this child be Immanuel, God with us, then without this child, this Immanuel, we be without God. Without Him in this world, saith the Apostle, and if without Him in this, without Him in the next; and if without Him then, if it be not Immanuel, it will be Immanu-hell. What with Him? Why, if we have him we need no more; Immanuel and Immanu-all."

We are saved from anti-climax here by the fact that the last of our preachers is probably the greatest. John Donne's eighty sermons are entitled to share with his poetry the highest estimation for literary good qualities; and there is an interesting field for study in a comparison of the two. I have been able only to hint at the results of such exploration.

Donne's biography is too well-known and too easily ascertainable for me to give any account of it here, more than to say that he wrote his poetry as a Papalist, and his sermons as an Anglican, late in life. He preached, as Dean of St. Paul's, to the "learneder and capable auditories," and Walton describes him in the pulpit as "an angel leaning from a cloud." His method was a perfect combination of the best things in his predecessors, wanting perhaps the humour of Latimer, but having a new tinge of Donne's own mystical imagination. His texts are diverse, but his subjects are the great commonplaces of the pulpit, death, marriage, and salvation. Death is his favourite subject, and his best. He has a way of dramatizing death, as in his first sermon he imagines a dialogue between the soul and "one of those worms which my dead body shall produce." There is one thought that recurs constantly in

his sermons—the thought of the scattered condition of man's body at the Day of Judgment. "Where be all the splinters of that Bone, which a shot hath shivered and scattered in the ayre?" he asks in that same first sermon—which is ostensibly about marriage. Again, in the twenty-third sermon, "Here a bullet will ask a man, where's your arm; and a wolf will ask a woman, where's your breast? A sentence in the Star-Chamber will ask him, where's your ear? and a month's close prison will ask him, where's your flesh? A fever will ask him, where's your red, and a morphew will ask him, where's your white?"

Now turn to the seventh of the Holy Sonnets and see this thought combined with another of Donne's favourite ideas—the glory of the Resurrection.

> "At the round earth's imagined corners blow
> Your trumpets, angels! and arise, arise
> From death, you numberless infinities
> Of souls, and to your scattered bodies go,
> All whom the flood did, and the fire shall, overthrow;
> All whom war, death, age, ague's tyrannies,
> Despair, law, chance, hath slain; and you whose eyes
> Shall behold God, and never taste death's woe."

Donne seems to have been something of a misogynist. His sermons are full of little uncomplimentary flings at the fair sex, and we find in the *Progress of the Soul* a poetical parallel:

> "Man all at once was there by woman slain,
> And one by one we're here slain o'er again
> By them. The mother poisoned the well-head,
> The daughters here corrupt us rivulets;
> No smallness 'scapes, no greatness breaks, their nets."

In his account of the Fall, Donne makes Adam's sin an act of pure magnanimity, and says he ate the apple which Eve proffered, "ne contristaretur delicias suas, lest he should deject her into a desperate sense of her sin."

Donne's preaching gained as much by his oratorical ability as Hooker's lost by ineffective delivery, and perhaps the occasional obscurity of the printed page would be clarified in utterance. It is by no means certain, moreover, that we have Donne's sermons as he spoke them. Like all his predecessors of the sixteenth and seventeenth century, he was accustomed to preach "without book" and the writing of the sermon as a connected whole was done later, when the plague of 1625 drove him out of London and gave him some months' leisure. But as we have them, Donne's sermons are eminently good reading. One may not agree with his theology, but at least he does not

irritate one by finical exegesis and subtle distinctions without a difference " which are all but forced dishes of hot brains and not sound meat." If one had to choose between Donne's poetry and his sermons, the poetry would gain the day; but for anyone who knows and enjoys the poems, the sermons are rich treasury of Donne's characteristic qualities.

Just as Latimer was not the first of the great preachers, so Donne was not the last; and when our centenarian is gathered unto his fathers there is Jeremy Taylor to preach his funeral sermon. But with Donne we pass out of the Elizabethan age and the Elizabethan spirit. Donne himself lived with one foot in the future, though he died a year before Ben Jonson, and it is less to him than to Hooker and Henrie Smith that we must go for a taste of the Elizabethan spirit " neat," as we go to Latimer for something more characteristic of the times of Ralph Roister Doister and Gammer Gurton. For we must not forget, in reading Hooker and Smith, that those who heard their sermons at the Temple or St. Clement Danes had only to cross the river to see the plays of Marlowe and Shakespeare. It is impossible not to wonder if Shakespeare heard them preach some Sunday morning when he could think of nothing else to do.

W. S. Porter.

JOHN DONNE, POET AND PREACHER

DEAN OF SAINT PAUL'S

Gradually the interest of students of literature seems to be veering back towards the early seventeenth century, the age which began in the last years of Shakespeare's life and stretched on to the time when pure letters amid the stress of civil war suffered a temporary eclipse. If the dramatic interest dwindled with Shirley, and was replaced by preoccupations more metaphysical, more theological, more simply moral, yet the changing sympathy never parted from poetry. There was no doubt prose great and majestic, like Milton's, or intimate and familiar, like Bunyan's, but still there predominated the supreme passion for verse, melody, song. The poets wrote up to the Civil War, were hardly quenched by it, yet changed their notes when it ended. There are two Miltons: he who wrote of *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained* is different from the poet of *Lycidas* and *Comus*. And the songs of the Restoration, of Waller, or of Suckling, have a different pitch from those of Herrick and Vaughan, and even of Andrew Marvell. It may be difficult to draw the line exactly, yet clearly there is a distinction between those who wrote before, and those who wrote after, the War.

Over the former there still clings the influence of the Elizabethan: the others with Dryden are learning a new expression.

To the first belongs that great writer, great poet, and great preacher John Donne, in whom during the last few years there has been a revival of interest so strongly marked. Perhaps it would not be an affectation to rank him, rather than Bishop Andrewes, among prose writers, as the last of the Elizabethans. Certainly his poetry had already a touch of archaism in it to those who came back with the Restoration King.

Donne, who was born in the same year as Archbishop Laud, is among the illustrious band who are connected, in varying ways, with that great primate. Laud was almost, if not quite, the greatest ecclesiastical patron of learning that England has ever had—of learning, that is, which was closely linked with religion. The Ferrars, in their haven of peace at Little Gidding, were his best beloved children. George Herbert he brought to ordination. He fostered the genius of Chillingworth; he began the advancement of Jeremy Taylor; to that charming poet, William Strode, he was the *intellectus agens*. The association with Donne is not so close. Perhaps Laud's serious moral outlook separated him from the young poet; though of the same age, they were not contemporaries at Oxford, for Donne matriculated when he was eleven, Laud not till he was sixteen. In later life there seems to have been a moment when the latter was critical of the former. Bishops and deans are not always intimate friends. But before Donne's death these two certainly had come to know each other well, for Laud, who was then Bishop of London, preached his funeral sermon. Among lost treasures this must greatly be regretted. How did the solitary statesman-prelate, in whom, but for his patronage of play-acting, there is hardly a touch of literary interest, appreciate the poet, whose heart was as sensitive as the strings of a lute? The sermon has perished. Very likely Prynne destroyed it, with many other precious things. We must describe Donne apart from the help it would have given us.

First, then, his life. John Donne was born in 1573, of a family connected with that of Sir Thomas More, which had been, in several of its members, ardent adherents of the Roman supremacy. "No family," he wrote himself in 1610, "which is not of far larger extent and greater branches, has endured and suffered more in their persons and fortunes for obeying the teachings of Roman doctrines." About 1585 he went to Hart Hall at Oxford, where to the scholarship of the day he probably added the "preoccupation with the Spanish language and literature which was so marked a feature of his mature career." And there he began his great friendship with Sir

Henry Wotton. Later on the University gave him the degree of M.A. because of his learning and his services to the State. Then he went to London and studied law at Lincoln's Inn. He wrote poems, and was perhaps the first to produce satires based on the Roman model. He became a follower of the brilliant Earl of Essex, with whom he saw the attack on Cadiz in 1596, and a year later the famous Islands voyage. Between 1597 and 1602 there is not much known of his life; but his poems show that he was, whether at Court or in society of the middle class, living, or at least writing as if he lived, recklessly and sensuously. Almost certainly in 1597 he entered the service of the Lord Keeper Egerton, who lived at York House, in the Strand. He fell in love with his favourite niece, Anne More, the daughter of Sir George More, of Losely, another family than that with which Donne was himself connected. In Advent, 1601, the two were secretly married. They were at once separated, and Donne, for the double offence—offence against the canon law in marrying a girl without the consent of her father, and the civil offence against the common law—soon found himself in prison. He made the most humble declaration of submission and penitence. There was wild rage among many notable people; but after many intercessions the inevitable was accepted and the couple were allowed to live together. To this period belong what are by far the best of Donne's poems. The verses of this time of anxiety and the next few years of peace have a higher reality, a feeling and a restraint of his eccentric fancy, which the later works do not always show. Some lines as characteristic in his best work we may quote here. He is speaking of the happiness of wedded love:

> "And yet no greater, but more eminent,
> Love by the Spring is grown;
> As in the firmament
> Stars by the sun are not enlarged, but shown,
> Gentle love-deeds, as blossoms on a bough,
> From love's awakening root do bud out now.
> If, as in water stirred more circles be
> Produced by one, love such additions take,
> Those like so many spheres but one heaven make,
> For they are all concentric unto thee;
> And tho' each spring do add to love new heat,
> As princes do in times of action get
> New taxes, and remit them not in peace,
> No winter shall abate this spring's increase." (*Poems*, i. 34-5.)

In the next year Donne wrote his curious *Progress of the Soul*, the most remarkable example of his strange genius. He lived at Mitcham; he was very poorly off, and he descended to

some, at least, of the arts of the begging letter-writer. In 1607 it was that Thomas Morton, then Dean of Gloucester, and afterwards Bishop of Durham, first suggested to him the idea of ordination. He rejected the advice, from a deep sense of unworthiness, though he was well aware that it would lead to promotion in the Church. He was in sore straits, but set himself seriously to consider the deepest problems of life and religion, and eventually light came. In 1608 his family were deep in sickness and poverty, and he wrote his *Biathanotos*, which was practically a defence of suicide. At this time he also prosecuted assiduously, if he did not begin, those theological studies which bore fruit later not only in his controversial treatise the *Pseudo-Martyr*, but also in his sermons and in his life. Following on these came his spiritual poems, of which the most important are the *Holy Sonnets*. By these ways gradually Donne came to see more clearly, and it was during these years that he was brought, perhaps through Carr, into the somewhat intimate knowledge of James I. It was by the King's strong advice, and after searching self-examination, that he was ordained early in 1615. His wife died in 1617, and it is certain that from that time he became something of an ascetic, besides a very earnest and serious preacher. As Preacher at Lincoln's Inn he had full opportunity for the exercise of his great gift. But he was no longer a strong man, and his health soon broke down completely, and was only partially restored by a tour in Germany with James I.'s Ambassador to the contending princes, the Earl of Doncaster. Not long after his return, in 1621, he was made Dean of S. Paul's. With this he continued to hold a country benefice and the rectory of S. Dunstan's-in-the-West. He lived ten years longer, and was most laborious in the discharge of his duties, and as a preacher far above any of the age save the saintly Andrewes. After a stormy youth his middle life was saintly and sincere, and he died on March 31, 1631, with all the quaint conceits in which his eccentric spirit delighted affecting even his preparation for death, as a Christian should die. His extraordinary monument, as is well known, is only the effigy from Old S. Paul's which survived the Fire, and may still be seen practically uninjured.

Donne will always be remembered as a poet; not quite a great poet—a poet's poet perhaps; unequal, not often reaching the very highest, yet often of passionate intensity; hardly ever quite simple, yet on a rare occasion exquisitely so; almost always profound and heart-searching, full all through of unfamiliar, unexpected felicities. No doubt in his satires the note is harsh; so it is (Mr. Saintsbury says intentionally) with his

contemporaries in the same field. But for the most part his style, if not smooth, is balanced. He knows what he wants to express, and he fits the expression to the thought, which even great writers do not always succeed in doing. One can illustrate Donne very well by quotations, and it is not necessary for this that his greatest pieces should be selected. Here is one of what he calls his Epithalamions. It is part of an eclogue on the marriage of Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset, to Frances Howard, younger daughter of the Earl of Suffolk, who had obtained a decree of the nullity of her marriage with Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex. The case was odious,* and the woman wicked; but Donne, in singing the new wedding, had at least the justification that Bishop Andrewes had voted for the nullity of the former marriage. And these are among the most characteristic lines of the poet's work:

"Now from your easts you issue forth, and we
As men, which through a cypress see
The rising sun, do think it two;
So, as you go to church, do think of you;
But that veil being gone,
By the church rites you are made from thenceforth one.
The church triumphant make this match before,
And now the militant doth strive no more.
Then, reverend priest, who God's Recorder art,
Do, from his dictates, to these two impart
All blessings which are seen, or thought, by angel's eye or heart."

Is that a little cumbrous? Certainly it has not the perfection of those two lines, the beginning of the *Autumnal*, addressed to George Herbert's mother:

"No spring nor summer beauty hath such grace
As I have seen in one autumnal face;"

or the audacious surprise of the four lines

"Twice or thrice had I loved thee,
Before I knew thy face or name;
So in a voice, so in a shapeless flame,
Angels affect us oft, and worshipped be;"

or the wonderful

"These hymns thy issue may increase so long
As still God's great *Venite* changed the song;"

and in the same poem, *An Anatomy of the World*:

"Think then, my soul, that death is but a groom,
Which brings a taper to the outward room,
Whence thou spiest first a little glimmering light,
And after brings it nearer to thy sight;"

* Perhaps the best, though I think it a prejudiced, summary, is that in Gardiner's *History of England*, 1603-1642, vol. ii., ch. 16.

or the startling description of the soul's liberty by death, flying upwards to the stars.

More famous still is that song, "Go catch a falling star," with the haunting melodious fancy:

"If thou be'st born to strange sights,
Things invisible to see,
Ride ten thousand days and nights,
Till age snow white hairs on thee.
Thou, when thou return'st, will tell me
All strange wonders that befell thee,
And swear
No where
Lives a woman true and fair."

Or, perhaps the most perfect of all the love-poems in Donne's special manner:

"I long to talk with some old lover's ghost,
Who died before the god of love was born.
I cannot think that he, who then loved most,
Sunk so low as to love one which did scorn.
But since this god produced a destiny,
And that vice-nature, custom, lets it be,
I must love her that loves not me."

But though such poems as these give Donne his secure place among the heirs of the Elizabethans, it is in his sacred verses that his flame is most pure and bright. *The Litany* has the lines to the Holy Spirit:

"O Holy Ghost, whose temple I
Am, but of mud walls, and condensèd dust,
And being sacrilegiously
Half wasted with youth's fires of pride and lust,
Must with new storms be weather-beat,
Double in my heart thy flame,
Which let devout sad tears intend, and let,
Though this glass lanthorn, flesh, do suffer maim,
Fire, sacrifice, priest, altar be the same."

nd afterwards that most characteristic touch:

"O blessed glorious Trinity,
Bones to philosophy, but milk to faith."

Those who think the seventeenth-century churchman scrupled his homage to our Lord's Mother should note the beautiful verse:

"For that fair blessed mother-maid,
Whose flesh redeem'd us, that she-cherubin,
Which unlock'd paradise, and made
One claim for innocence, and disseisèd sin,

Whose womb was a strange heaven, for there
God clothed Himself, and grew,
Our zealous thanks we pour. As her deeds were
Our helps, so are her prayers; nor can she sue
In vain, who hath such titles unto you."

And still more emphatic are the lines:

"O thou who hast made Him that first made thee!
O near of kin to all the Trinity!
O palace, where the King of all, and more,
Went in and out, yet never open'd door,
Whose flesh is purer than another's spirit,
Reach Him our prayers, and reach us down His merit!
O bread of life which swelld'st up without leaven!
O bridge which join'st together earth and heaven!
Whose eyes see me through these walls, and through glass,
And through this flesh as thorough cypress pass,
Behold a little heart made great by thee
Swelling, yet shrinking at thy majesty.
O dwell in it! for wheresoe'er thou go'st
There is the temple of the Holy Ghost." (*Poems*, ii. 284.)

But greatest of all, and not to be shortened in quotation, is the *Hymn to God the Father* (*ibid.*, p. 213):

1.

"Wilt Thou forgive that sin where I begun,
Which was my sin, though it were done before?
Wilt Thou forgive the sin, through which I run,
And do run still, though still I do deplore?
When Thou hast done, Thou hast not done,
For I have more.

2.

"Wilt Thou forgive that sin which I have won
Others to sin, and made my sin their door?
Wilt thou forgive that sin which I did shun
A year or two, but wallowed in a score?
When thou hast done, thou hast not done,
For I have more.

3.

"I have a sin of fear, that when I have spun
My last thread, I shall perish on the shore;
But swear by thyself, that at my death Thy Son
Shall shine as he shines now, and heretofore;
And having done that, thou hast done;
I fear no more."

And yet I cannot forbear to add one more:

"Hear us, O hear us, Lord; to Thee
A sinner is more music when he prays,
Than spheres' or angels' praises be,
In panegyric alleluias;
Hear us, for till Thou hear us, Lord,
We know not what to say;
Thine ear to our sighs, tears, thoughts, gives voice and word;
O Thou, who Satan heard'st in Job's sick days,
Hear Thyself now, for Thou in us dost pray." (*Ibid.*, p. 185.)

What shall we say of this poet? I think the best that can be said is what Mr. Saintsbury says: "For those who have experienced or at least understand the ups-and-downs, the ins-and-outs of human temperament, and alternations not merely of passion and satiety, but of passion and laughter, of passion and melancholy reflection, of passion earthly enough and spiritual rapture almost heavenly, there is no poet and hardly any writer like Donne."

Now, how could such a poet become a preacher? Few who preach good sermons can write good poetry; still fewer who write true poetry care to teach, however nobly, in prose. But Donne's passionate nature burned to express itself in the direction of men's souls. As a parish priest at S. Dunstan's-in-the-West, Izaak Walton's parish, and as Dean of S. Paul's, which, again and again in English history, has had the most distinguished congregations in the land, he showed himself to the individual and to the multitude the true guide of souls. Izaak Walton,* who may have heard nearly all the sermons he ever preached, tells that James I., a shrewd judge of men's intellects if not always of their characters, said before his ordination that he would prove himself a powerful preacher, and that Donne "was so happy (which few are) as to satisfie and exceed men's expectation of him; . . . preaching the Word so, as shewed his own heart was possest with those very thoughts and joys that he laboured to distil into others. A Preacher in carnest, weeping sometimes for his auditory, sometimes with them; always preaching to himself, like an Angel from a cloud, but in none; carrying some, as S. Paul was, to Heaven in holy raptures, and enticing others by a sacred Art and Courtship to amend their lives; here painting a vice so as to make it ugly to those who practised it, and a virtue so as to make it beloved even by those that loved it not, and all this with a most particular grace and an unexpressible addition of comeliness." Tears, it is said, and raptures were at his command. Men understood all that he said, and knew that he felt it. What

* *Life of Donne* (1670), pp. 34-38.

more, when this reality is carried into great literature, can be desired of one who would preach Christ?

Donne was a theologian as well as a preacher—again a combination not common to-day. The former qualification for his high office can be traced through his works as well as in his sermons. His religious interest was certainly not purely theological.

John Donne the younger, who seems to be chiefly memorable for endeavouring to make money by his father's writings—not without a certain desire, let us hope, for his fame—when he published in 1644 (without date) the curious piece of mystifications *βίαθανατος*, for which his father had forbidden "both the press and the fire," claimed that it "facilitated the issue of death." He dedicated it to Lord Philip Herbert. This person seems to have been usually regarded as the Earl of Pembroke, to whom the First Folio of Shakespeare was inscribed, as well as many other notable things. But if the argument against "Mr. W. H.," as a Star Chamber matter, holds good, one may more reasonably think that the great Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, Chancellor of the University of Oxford, would not thus be addressed; Philip, his son (1619-1669), may perhaps more reasonably be identified as the nobleman meant. The book itself those who have discoursed upon it seem to have taken seriously, perhaps because, as Donne says,* "contemplative and foolish men must of necessity be more quarrelsome than others, because they contend not about matters of faith, nor can determine their controversies by any certain witness, nor judges"; but (if we avoid the ambages of the schoolmen) we may more naturally regard the book as a literary exercise, in the composition of which an ironical humour and an assumed pedantry have an equal share. The preface is enough to show this. There Donne, in a passage which is typical of the deliciousness of his style, says, "If, therefore, after a Christian protestation of an innocent purpose herein, and after a submission of all which is said, not only to every Christian Church, but to every Christian man, and after entreaty that the Reader with this advice of Tabaeus (Sever., Trihaeres l. 2, cap. 17): *Qui litigant sint ambo in conspectu tuo mali et rei*, and trust neither me nor the adverse part, but the Reasons, there be any scandal in this enterprise of mine, it is taken, not given. And though I know that the malicious prejudged man, and the lazy affectors of ignorance, will use the same calumnies and obstructions towards me (for the voice and sound of the Snake and Goose is all one), yet because I thought that, as in the pool of Bethesda, there was no health till the water was troubled, so the best way

* *βίαθανατος*, p. 20.

to find the truth in this matter was to debate and vex it (for [Athenagoras, *de resur.*] we must as well dispute *de veritate* as *pro veritate*), I abstained not for fear of misinterpretation from this undertaking."

As to his theology, there is in it the usual severe anti-Romanism of his period. Roman controversialists were trying their best to de-catholicize the Church in England, and it seemed to English writers that attack was often the best form of defence. But there is no reason to be surprised, as Mr. Goose was,* that Donne should speak of "the great patriarchal Catholic Church, of which every one of us is a little chapel," or to think that he "was the only man in England who would have spoken" so. The English writers of the age were all proud of belonging to the Catholic Church in its patriarchal origin and aspect, and would never allow the Romanists the right to arrogate the possession to themselves. Donne himself helped Morton in his *Catholic Appeal*. And that his own position was anti-Roman enough is clear from the *Pseudo-Martyr*, 1610. He had Romanist connections certainly; his mother, it seems, remained a papist till her death; but even if he had been brought up a Romanist, which is doubtful, his later convictions were quite firm. The *Pseudo-Martyrs* was dedicated to James I., and must have been a book after that learned monarch's own heart.

It is a close and coherent argument in which Catholic principles are accepted, but the application of them by Paul V. is disputed. There is no justification, it is argued, for a Romanist to refuse the oath of allegiance, for that carries no more in it than is required by the King of France. It is really a very delightful and witty book; not easy to analyse, but very pleasant to read, and, from the Englishman's point of view, convincing. A vain affection of martyrdom is the Jesuits'; and that, in the seventeenth century, was the view, as of English law, so of English laity. English folk adhered to the religion they had been brought up in; they accepted the laws of their country, and would admit no political breach of them to entitle a man to be a martyr. Donne wrote in a copy he gave away the Spanish motto, "De juegos el major es con la hoja." He was fond of Spanish proverbs. They have not always been understood.† This means, quite simply, "The best part of the sword is in the blade." In the 1635 edition of his poems the portrait has added to it the words "Antes muerto que mudado," which Mr. Gosse translated, "Before I am dead how much shall I be changed." If the words had meant that they might have been significant of a belief on Donne's part, when he

* *Life of Donne*, vol. ii., p. 321. † *Ibid.*, i. 248; and i. 24.

was eighteen, that though he was a naughty boy then, he would become a good old man before he died. But they only mean "rather dead than changed"—another proverb the application of which towards the book it prefaces can be little more than general. Spanish, perhaps, was the language of his own time that Donne liked and knew best; his diplomatic experience no doubt means that he understood French and German; yet, as with all the scholars of his time, Greek and Latin were his first and last loves. This is plain from his sermons. Let us take a few passages from these which illustrate his learning as well as his power as a preacher—a practical, a dogmatic, and a controversial passage in turn.

The first takes the doctrine of God in its bearing directly upon human life:

"There* is nothing good in this life, nothing in the next, without God—that is, without sight and fruition of the face and presence of God, which is that which *S. Augustine* intends when he says, *Secutio Dei est appetitus Beatitatis, consecutio Beatitas* (our looking towards God, is the way to Blessedness, but Blessedness itself is only the sight of God Himself).

"That therefore thou maist begin thy heaven here, put thyself in the sight of God, put God in thy sight, in every particular action. We cannot come to the body of the Sun, but we can use the light of the Sun many waies; we cannot come to God himself here, but yet we can see him by many manifestations; so many, as that *S. Augustine*, in his chap. xx. *De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae*, hath collected a right place of Scripture, where every one of our senses is called a Seeing; there is a *gustate et videte*, and *audite*, and *palpate; tasting*, and *hearing*, and *feeling*, and all, to this purpose, are called seeing. In all our senses, in our faculties, we may see God if we will; God sees us at midnight, He sees us, then, when we had rather He looked off. If we see Him so, it is a blessed interview. How would he that were come abroad at midnight, to doe a mischiefe, sneak away, if he saw the watch? What a damp must it necessarily cast upon any sinner, in the nearest approach to his sin, if he can see God. See Him before thou sinnest; then He looks lovingly. After the sin remember how fain *Adam* would have hid himself from God: He that goes one step out of God's sight is loath to come into it again; If you will sit at the right hand of God hereafter, you must walk with God here; So *Abraham*, and so *Enoch walked with God, and God took him.* God knowes, God takes not every man that dies; God says to the rich, secure man, *Foole, this night they shall fetch away thy soule;* but He does not tell him who. That then you be no

* Donne, *LXX Sermons*, 1640, p. 169.

strangers to God then, see Him now; and remember that His last judgement is expressed in that word, *Nescio vos, I know you not;* not to be known by God is damnation; and God knows no man there with whom He was not acquainted here. There is none good but God; the fruition of that God is in seeing Him; the way to see Him there is to look towards Him here."

The second expands the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit.*

"There is then a difficulty, no less than an impossibility, in searching after the Holy Ghost, but it is in those things which appertain not to us; but in others there is a possibility, a facility and easiness. For there are two processions of the Holy Ghost, *Æterna* and *Temporaria*, his proceeding from the Father, and the Son, and his proceeding into us. The first we shall never understand if we read all the books of the world. The other we shall not choose but understand if we study our own consciences. In the first the darkness and difficulty is recompenced in this, that though it be hard to find anything, yet it is but little that we are to seek. It is only to find that there is a Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son; for in searching farther the danger is noted by *S. Basil* to be thus great. *Qui quomodo interrogas et ubi ut in loco et quando ut in tempore interrogabis.* If thou give thy curiosity the liberty to ask how the Holy Spirit proceeded, thou wilt ask where it was done, as though there were severall roomes, and distinct places, in that which is infinite. And thou wilt ask when it was done, as though there were pieces of time, in that which is eternall. *Et quæres, non ut fidem, sed ut infidelitatem invenias* (which is excellently added by that Father). The need of thy inquiring will not be that thou mightest finde anything to establish thy beliefe, but to finde something that might excuse thy unbeliefe. All thy curious questions are not in hope that thou shalt receive satisfaction, but in hope that the weakness of the answer may justify thy infidelity.

"Thus it is, if we will be ever curious in the first, the eternal proceeding of the Holy Ghost. In the other, the proceeding of the Holy Ghost unto us, we are to consider, that as in our natural persons the body and the soul do not make a perfect man, except they be united, except our spirits (which are the active part of the blood) do fit this body and soul for one another's working; so, though the body of our religion may seem to be determined in these two, our Creation, which is commonly attributed to the Father, *Tanquam fonti Deitatis*, as the fountaine of the Godhead (for Christ is God of God) and

* Donne, *LXX Sermons*, 1640, Sermon xxxii.

our Redemption, which belongs to the Son, yet for this body there is a spirit, that is the Holy Ghost, that takes this man, upon whom the Father hath wrought by Creation, and the Son, included within his Redemption, and he works in him a Vocation, a Justification, and a sanctification, and leads him from that *Esse* which the Father gave him in the Creation, and that *Bene esse* which he hath on being admitted into the body of his Son, the visible Church and Congregation, to an *optime esse*, to that perfection, which is an assurance of the inhabitation of this Spirit in him, and an inchoation of eternall blessedness here, by a heavenly and sanctified conversation, without which Spirit *no man can say that Jesus is the Lord*, because he is not otherwise in a perfect obedience to him if he embrace not the means ordained by him in his Church. So that this Spirit disposes, and dispenses, distributes, and disperses, and orders all the powers of the Father, and all the wisdome of the Son, and all the graces of God. It is a center to all. So *S. Bernard* says upon those words of the Apostle, *We approve ourselves as the ministers of God*. But by what? *By watching, by fasting, by suffering, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfained. Vide tanquam omnia ordinantem, quomodo in medio virtutum, sicut cor in medio corporis, constituit Spiritum Sanctum.* As the heart is in the midst of the body, so between these vertues of fasting and suffering before, and love unfained after, the Apostle places the Holy Ghost, who only gives life and soul to all Morall and all Theologicall vertues. And as *S. Bernard* observes that in particular men, so doth *S. Augustine* of the whole Church, *quod in corpore nostro anima, id in Corpore Christi, Ecclesia, Spiritus Sanctus.* That office which the soul performs to our body, the Holy Spirit performes in the body of Christ, which is the Church."

And in the third point of controversy, after denying transubstantiation, he goes on (*ibid.*, p. 37):

"We refuse not the words of the Fathers in which they have expressed themselves in this mystery. Not *Irenæus* his *est corpus*, that that bread is his body now. Not *Tertullian's fecit corpus*, that that bread is made his body, which was not so before. Not *S. Cyprian's mutatus*, that that bread is changed. Not *Damascene's supernaturaliter mutatus*, that that bread is not only changed so in the use, as when at the King's table certain portions of bread are made bread of Essay, to passe over every dish, whether for safety or for Majesty; not only so civilly changed, but changed supernaturally; no nor *Theophylact's transformatus est* (which seems to be the word that goes farthest of all), for this transforming cannot be intended of the outward form and fashion, for that

is not changed; but be it of that internal form, which is the very essence and nature of the bread, so it is transformed, so the bread hath secured a new form, a new essence, a new nature, because, whereas the nature of bread is but to nourish the body, the nature of this bread now, is to nourish the soule. And therefore, *Cum non dubitavit Dominus dicere, hoc est corpus meum cum signum daret corporis*, since Christ forebore not to say, This is my body, when he gave the sign of his body, why should we forbeare to say of that bread, This is Christ's body, which is the sacrament of his body? You would have said at noone, this light is the Sun, and you will say now, this light is the candle. That light was not the Sun, this light is not the candle, but it is that portion of aire which the Sun did then, and which the candle doth now, enlighten. We say the Sacramental bread is the body of Christ, because God hath shed his ordinance upon it, and made it of another nature in the use, though not in the substance. Almost six hundred years agoe the Romane Church made *Berengarius* sweare, *sensualiter tangitur, frangitur teritur corpus Christi*, that the body of Christ was sensibly handled, and broken, and chewed. They are ashamed of that now and have mollified it with many modifications; and God knows whether a hundred years hence they will not be as much ashamed of their transubstantiation, and see as much unnatural absurdity in their Trent Canon or Lateran Canon, as they doe in *Berengarius oath*. As they that deny the body of Christ to be in the Sacrament lose their footing in departing from their ground, the expresse Scriptures; so they that will assign a particular manner, how that body is there, have no footing, no ground at all, no Scriptures to Anchor upon. And so, diving in a bottomless sea, they poppe sometimes above water, to take breath, to appeare to say something, and then snatch at a loose preposition, that swims upon the face of the waters; and so the Roman Church hath catched a *Trans*, and others a *Con*, and a *Sub* and an *In*, and varied their poetry into a Transubstantiation, and a Constibstantiation and the rest, and rymed themselves beyond reason into absurdities and heresies and by a young figure of *similiter cadens*, they are fallen alike into error, though the errors that they are fallen into be not of a like nature, nor danger. We offer to go no farther, than according to his word. In the Sacrament our eyes see his salvation according to that, so far, as that hath manifested unto us, and in that light we depart in peace, without scruple in our owne, without offence to other men's consciences."

Such passages display Donne as a theologian, and the taste of his age welcomed a theologian in the pulpit. But for pure

eloquence also we do not listen in vain in the sermons. He was as fond as Shakespeare's Richard II. of graves and worms and epitaphs; but he used them to point a tremendous moral rather than to adorn a pathetic tale. Here is a passage: "I respite thee not till the day of judgement, when thou wilt call upon the hills to cover thee; nor till the day of thine own death, when thou shalt have evidence enough of thy Maker by feeling hell. I respite thee but a few hours, but six hours, but till midnight. Wake then, and then, dark and alone, hear God ask thee then, and remember that I ask thee now: Is there a God? And if thou darest, say No!" But the same thought of death he could transmute too into beauty when he heard the passing bell: "In this contemplation I make account that I hear this dead brother of ours who is now carried out to his burial, to speak to me, and to preach my funeral sermon in the voice of these bells." And, as his *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions* (1624), recently very delightfully edited, with a preface of remarkable charm and understanding, by Mr. John Sparrow, Scholar of Winchester College,* show, he had a very intimate knowledge of the human heart. This book is one to be read again and again. It was written to record the dreary days of a long-continued illness, and how each was turned into happiness by the beauty of prayer. Physiological and psychological in a strange commixture, these Devotions are. In the tensity of their excitement they equal, even surpass perhaps, anything that Donne ever wrote. The book is a very quintessence of his thought and his expression. Mr. Sparrow calls them "our most intimate picture of Donne's deepest feelings," and it would not be possible to describe the book more happily than he has done, thus:

"Here Donne's mind is following his soul on a pilgrimage towards Heaven, through strange and wonderful lands, by unexpected and inexplicable ways, and with many turnings, halts, and digressions; his body, once the explorer of other countries where it found much pleasure but no repose, is the soul's companion; and in these pages that sincere and subtle mind, a vivid but perverse historian, tells us intimately of some of their adventures on the journey, and leaves us wondering where and how it was to end."†

There are many passages in this book as in the Sermons which show with what entire candour he could describe temptation and with what intimate knowledge startle the reader or the hearer. Here is one from a sermon:

"I throw myself down in my chamber, and I call in and

* Cambridge University Press, 1923.
† Preface, p. xxiv.

invite God and His angels hither. And when they are there I neglect God and His angels for the noise of a fly, for the rattling of a coach, for the whining of a door. I talk on in the same posture of praying; eyes lifted up, knees bowed down, as though I prayed to God. And if God or His angels should ask me when I thought last of God in that prayer, I cannot tell. Sometimes I find that I had forgot what I was about: but when I began to forget it I cannot tell. A memory of yesterday's pleasures, a fear of to-morrow's dangers, a straw under my knee, a light in my eye, an anything, a nothing, a fancy, a Chimera in my brain—troubles me in prayer."

There are many passages all through the work, in poetry, in prose, like this, showing the writer as he was, as he lived and thought.

Enough has been said and quoted to show the multiplicity of this man's genius. It remains to add a word or two as to his character and influence. Both these can be tested, as with most men, by his friendships. And if we pick out among his intimates, passing by some, surely we shall choose Sir Henry Wotton, the diplomatist, and Izaak Walton, the fisherman.

Sir Henry Wotton was a devoted and lifelong friend of Donne. They were both at Hart Hall, Oxford, in 1584, when Donne was only eleven and Wotton sixteen; it may be that they were there two years together. Ten years later, in 1596, both went on the famous expedition of Essex to Cadiz. (Was it on this expedition that the two friends became so much interested in Spanish, like Essex himself, who spoke the language, we know?) It seems, too, that three years afterwards, when Wotton was still with Essex, now in Ireland "amongst bogs and woods," he kept up the correspondence with his friend, whom in youth and in age he "did thoroughly love." Donne wrote letters to him in verse, and he replied in prose, though he was a good poet too. In truth, as Walton says, "there was such a friendship contracted in their youth that nothing but death could force the separation. And though their bodies were divided, that learned knight's love followed his friend's fame beyond the forgetful grave," and he planned to write his life, but died ere he had written it.

So the task fell to Izaak Walton, his parishioner, the friend of the good Bishop Morley, the biographer of Hooker and George Herbert and Sanderson, and of Wotton himself. And Izaak Walton's life is one of the classics of our literature. Biography in little is an essence of character which is uncommon to-day. We are all discursive and, most of us, minute when we write of those whom we have known. Not so Walton. He knew Donne, one may be quite sure, with intimacy; not as a

sycophantic parishioner, but as a personal and not uncritical friend. He knew that his youth had been too like S. Augustine's; he knew also that his after life for piety could match any saint of the past. The youth was "irregular"; the age was conspicuously holy. He was too near the time he wrote of, and very likely too well acquainted with the facts, to regard Donne's love poems as serious material for biography. A candid explanation of them proves that they are no such thing. Shakespeare's Sonnets, a great authority rather rashly thinks, are rather poetic exercises than practical biography. There are reasons against that view, but there are few, if any, against the artificiality of Donne's amatory verse. Yet Walton does not ignore these poems; only he will not quote them, as he quotes the facts he knew, for evidence as to the man Donne was. Again, the facts show that Donne made a real change of life when he was ordained, not later. In this, or in any notable fact, Walton does not err. But the great merit of this wonderful sketch is that it gives so vivid a picture of the man. A man whose passionate loyalty to his beliefs was as plain in his divinity as in his poems; a master of eloquence and of true feeling; a generous lover and friend, a devoted pastor and penitent, a priest whose faith in God was as near as that of any man living on earth can be to sight. Donne belongs to the company of S. Paul and S. Bernard and S. Francis, and Hooker and Wesley and Pusey and Newman.

NOTE.—I may here add the additions I have actually used for the purpose of this article.

DONNE: Βίαθανατος undated (1644).
Pseudo-Martyr, 1610.
Sermons, vol. i., 1640.
Sermons, vol. ii., 1649.
Poems. (Ed. Chambers.) 2 vols., undated.
Devotions. (Ed. Sparrow.) 1923.
Paradoxes and Problems. (Ed. Keynes.) 1923.
GOSSE: *Life and Letters of Donne*. 2 vols. 1899.
PEARSALL SMITH: *Life and Letters of Wotton*. 2 vols. 1907.
JESSOPP: *Donne*. 1897.
WALTON: *Lives of Donne, etc.* 1670.
BEECHING: "Izaak Walton's Life of Donne," in the *Cornhill Magazine*, N.S. viii., 249 *sqq*.
"The Life of Donne," in *The Athenæum*, No. 3,762, December 2, 1899.
"Mr. Gosse's Life of Donne," in *The Spectator*, November 11, 1899.

W. H. HUTTON.

NEWMAN'S "FIDUS ACHATES"

THE only "unconsidered trifle" I ever picked up in the Farringdon Road, where the Sisyphus of "the Trade" so persistently outwits poor Autolycus, was a *Pars Æstiva* of a Mechlin Breviary, dated 1843, and bearing this inscription: "Ambrose St. John. J.H.N., 1846." Recollecting the famous passage at the close of the *Apologia*, I experienced one of those ecstatic moments in the life of the book-hunter when he realizes that he has stumbled on a prize.

Comparison with other specimens of Newman's autograph leaves no doubt as to the genuineness of the inscription. The date is, of course, that of the journey which the two friends took across the continent Romewards—a pilgrimage so fully narrated by Wilfred Ward in his *Life* of Newman.* As this journey was in all probability the occasion of the gift, another "association" enriches the treasure, and though subsequent enquiry failed to bring to light the other three volumes, I may not unjustly feel compensated by this single discovery for the unrewarded hours spent in the Street of Disappointed Hope.

Let me recall the passage to which I have alluded. Newman is offering the "history of his religious opinions," concluded on St. Philip's Day, to "St. Philip's sons—" those, namely, who were with him at the time in the Oratory at Birmingham, and to whose loving care and loyalty he makes so generous a tribute:

"And to you especially, dear Ambrose St. John, whom God gave me when He took everyone else away; who are the link between my old life and my new; who have now for twenty-one years been so devoted to me, so patient, so zealous, so tender; who have let me lean so hard upon you; who have watched me so narrowly; who have never thought of yourself, if I was in question."†

The subject of this affectionate and touching tribute, whose renown stands almost entirely in the service he rendered his friend and master, was born in 1815, and was thus fourteen years Newman's junior. He was the son of Henry St. John, descended from the Barons St. John of Bletsoe, ancestors also of the Bolingbroke St. Johns and of the friend of Pope. Educated at Westminster, he proceeded to Christ Church where he first met Newman. In 1841 he was ordained to the curacy of Walmer, under Henry Wilberforce, with whom he removed shortly afterwards to East Farleigh. He then returned to Oxford, and joined Newman at Littlemore, and on October 2,

* i., 135-153. † *Apologia* (1st Edition), p. 430.

1845, he was received into the Roman Church at Prior Park.* Newman followed his disciple in a few days. For a time they remained together at Littlemore, then removed to Maryvale, and in the following autumn set out for Rome.

Then commenced those delightful letters, of which, alas, only a few have been preserved. They constitute the only "remains" which Ambrose St. John, scholar though he was, has left behind him. They were thrown off artlessly at the end of fatiguing journeys, social functions, and religious ceremonies solely to satisfy the solicitude of those who were thirsting for news of their chief, and by one to whom the welfare of that chief rose above every other human interest. If affection, information, and eagerness go to make a good letter, we have all the materials here. Of their stay at Besançon he writes to Dalgairns on September 21:

"I need not tell you how extremely hospitable the Archbishop was; how he showed us everything . . . took us over the cathedral, and told us everything about it. To come to what is more to the point, after all this we had dinner, where, to our infinite amusement, there was for 'maigre' fare a dish of fricassed frogs! Oh, for the *Record* or the *English Churchman!* I rather think Newman relished them, but I am sure that it was out of obedience that he ate them."†

Speaking of Pius IX. and his attitude towards contemporary tendencies, he writes, November 16:

"It is curious how exactly all this coincides with Newman's line. But now here comes the rub—how, in the want of a free knowledge of the language and of influential persons to represent N.'s capabilities . . . is the Pope, without almost a supernatural guidance, to put N. in the way of carrying out any plan of establishing a school of philosophy or any other purpose. How is the Pope to know the influence N. has on the minds of others; how that he is almost alone as a preacher to students and divines of an English turn of mind? All these things, when on the spot (*i.e.*, in Rome), present themselves as practical difficulties which are not easy to solve. N., as you know, is not the person to solve them by putting himself forward."‡

Here we see St. John's power of summing-up a situation. It was a situation which was soon to disclose all the elements of tragedy! Probably both men set out under the impression that a straightforward course lay before them. It was only when "on the spot," and to the shrewder and more worldly-wise of the two, that "things presented themselves as practical difficulties not easy to solve." That Newman *felt* them to be so is as evident as is the patience with which he underwent all

* Ward, i., p. 94 *n.* † *Ibid.*, i., 137. ‡ *Ibid.*, i., 149.

that followed. That he ever grasped their inevitability, that he ever even "sensed" the incompatibility between himself and his new environment, is improbable, and therein lay the more part of the tragedy. He was fresh from "the blessed vision of peace"; he had attained what he subsequently describes as "long sought after, tardily found, desire of the eyes, joy of the heart, the truth after many shadows, the home after many storms";* and to this home he brought much who brought but himself; bright and keen was the sword he laid down at the shrine of Peter, and he looked forward to receiving it again to use in Peter's service. Use it again he did, whether ever as effectually as before it is still too early to judge, but it was not until after weary years of conflict with misunderstanding too deeply seated in differing mentalities for human censure. There lay the tragedy; and its presence was perceived by his disciple from the first days of their sojourn in Rome.

There is in one of Ward's volumes a portrait showing the two men together. The contrast they afford is significant. On the one hand we see the attenuated figure, his limbs drawn together, his face querulous and perturbed, raised as though in surprise at finding himself in so weird a world. By his side stands the sturdy frame of St. John; massive shoulders, a bull neck, a shrewd and jolly face, his eyes screwed up as though attempting to focus "practical difficulties not easy to solve." It is not a face one associates with Greek theology nor with the subtleties of the *Grammar of Assent*. Rather it reminds one of a saying attributed to Liddon: "'I have set my face like a flint'—or, as we should say to-day, like a pudding."

Shrewdness and pertinacity are the qualities indexed in that face; qualities not of the leader but of the champion, a champion indispensable to a leader so unworldly, so motherless a child. And those strong qualities, with much more also of humour, resource, and a gentleness so often accompanying the "bull-dog breed," were ever at Newman's disposal throughout the long and trying thirty-two years during which, as he gratefully acknowledges, "he was given to me."†

But to return to the Letters. The first clash of incompatibilities arose when Newman was desired to preach a sermon to Protestants in Rome on the occasion of the death of Lady Shrewsbury's niece. Probably a more misjudged task was never imposed on an obedient servant. The brief handed Newman, or rather the text from which he was to preach, was the fact that the poor young lady had died suddenly still "out of grace,"

* *Discources to Mixed Congregations*, "Of Nature and Grace," p. 281.
† Letter on the occasion of St. John's death (Ward, ii., 410).

though surrounded by every incentive to make her peace with the Church. The congregation was composed largely of Protestant connections of Lady Shrewsbury. It does not need much imagination to perceive the effect of salt thus rubbed into the wound! Newman was altogether averse from the task, but, having out of obedience undertaken it, he was not the man to trim his doctrine, nor is it easy to see how the particular doctrine could be trimmed. "You will have little difficulty in imagining the sermon," St. John writes to Dalgairns:

"In many respects not unlike some of his printed sermons, according to request turning the event into an argument of the necessity of the conversion of every one of us. You may fancy him saying: 'We all need conversion.' He addressed the Protestants, commenting on the usual miserable irreverence of the English in the churches. He especially excepted all who had come to the funeral, saying: 'Do then for God what you are willing to do for men you love. Help this poor soul by your conversion as Catholics can by their prayers.' He concluded by a beautiful panegyric on the real greatness of the Anglo-Saxon character. Such a sermon to you and me would be an old friend; but excepting myself, I really believe it was a new idea to every soul present. The majority, including many old-staging catholics who brought Protestant friends to hear the music, were disgusted to see their friends whipped before their faces. The Protestants, whose sole idea seems to be that N. called them all brutes and dogs, became quite rabid. The disease, propagated at balls and parties, has spread to an amazing extent. All this would be of mighty little consequence, but Talbot has spread far and wide that the Pope told him (Talbot) that N. had spoken too strongly to the Protestants, and that he supposed he was more of a philosopher than an orator."*

Far heavier was the cloud that rose upon the heels of this—the unfortunate identification of Newman's views as expressed in the *Essay on Development* with the extreme left of American liberalism. Was ever irony meted out to any man as to Newman! Opposition to liberalism had been the *fons et origo* of the "movement" he had commenced, and which had culminated, so far as concerned himself, in the *Essay* in question. And now, lo, amid the laughter of the gods, the *Essay* is suspect of the very opinions he had so strenuously combatted! If Newman had been advised to translate the work into Latin immediately on his submission, all might have been well. As it was, it had to reach the authorities through the medium of

* Ward, i., p. 155.

the French, and never did "language obscure thought" to more sinister purpose. The fact was, Newman, so conservative, so intransigeant, was at least a quarter of a century before his time, and his anticipations of what is now the A B C of the comparative study of religion at that time filled men like Brownson and Perrone with alarm. The idea of "development" was as novel to Rome as St. John says was the idea of conversion, and with the example of Lamennais still green in the memory of the Curia it is perhaps pardonable in them to have looked askance at the novelty. Anyway, the Essay which carried Newman out of the Church of England bade fair to brand him a heretic at papal headquarters, and did, in fact, render his every movement suspect till he was raised to the purple.

In all this St. John had to stand by. He could not mediate Newman's theory to the Holy Father any more than he could disperse the cloud of poisonous flies that buzzed about the unfortunate sermon.

"These people have tried Newman a great deal," he writes at the close of 1846. "Nothing is so harassing as to hear suspicions, and not to be able to get anything definite to act upon. So far as I see, Newman's game is to wait and let his book fight its own way. Again, it harasses him much to be lugged head and shoulders into controversy again. The truth is we want the Church in England to back us against prejudices. In all practical work we shall be backed most heartily . . . but in theology all is as yet quite uncertain."*

So completely does the writer of these letters identify himself with his master's interests that to pursue the story in detail would be to retell the long tragedy of Newman. Except at short periods they were always together, and Newman had the unspeakable comfort of St. John's counsel and devotion during those successive "ardours and endurances" which marked his life in the Roman Church. With one exception, all those activities proved abortive. The scheme for a translation of the Scriptures (in Newman's English !); the Irish university; the idea of a Catholic centre in Oxford—all alike, after infinite delays, came to nothing. To the reader of Ward they stretch out like vast tracts of desert trodden successively by the great pilgrim, each with its appropriate mirage, and each finding him at the end "in a land of sand and thorns." The one exception was the project which first engaged Newman's attention, of establishing an Order of St. Philip in England. This, after incredible labour and anxiety on the one side, distrust and opposition on the other, was achieved, and the Oratory was

* Ward, i., p. 174.

set up in Birmingham. Even then it was not evident what use was to be made of it, and for long it languished, struggling with debt and difficulties, so that it reminded St. John of "the famous story of the man who had bought an elephant, and was too poor to keep it, too merciful to kill it, and unable to persuade anyone to accept it." But humour yields to pathos as the story which Ward unfolds through so many hundred pages convinces us that the "white elephant" was Newman himself! Rome never trusted him, and did not know what to do with him.

An instance of the way in which Newman "leaned on" his friend is afforded in a letter written by him when Dalgairns was removed from Birmingham to the Branch of the Oratory set up in London. He had a whimsical notion that seven years was all that was allowed him for the companionship of those he most loved. "Froude was with me from 1827 to 1834. Rogers from 1833 to 1840, and when at the end of that time I saw him get on the Oxford coach for the continent, I thought of the seven years and wondered whether I should ever be with him again. (His own step in 1845 made the separation permanent.) Dalgairns came up to Littlemore in 1842, and he leaves in 1849. Don't mention this," he adds significantly, "as I have *before now* been afraid of Fr. Ambrose getting hold of it—he is so fanciful."

In this case, however, Providence extended the seven years lease. Together, taking their lives in their hands, they went to minister to the cholera-stricken population of Bilston. Together they faced the iniquities of the Achilli Trial when, owing to the inexplicable indolence of Wiseman, Newman was left at the mercy of a band of scoundrels, and the first spiritual genius of the age was publicly reprimanded in a court of justice. Had it not been for St. John's practical activities at that time in collecting witnesses and otherwise contributing to the defence it is not improbable that English justice might have lain for ever under the reproach of having committed Newman to prison! They were together during all the opprobrium which attended Newman's conduct of the *Rambler* and the *Home and Foreign Review*, and during those five years which Ward aptly capitulates "Sad Days" in the last chapter of the first volume. In 1867 we find St. John going to Rome on a mission about the Oratory School and the proposed Oxford College—of all schemes the nearest Newman's heart. His letters to his chief from "the seat of war" form curious reading.* No more tangled labyrinth of diplomacy was ever trod, and that by a man ill-equipped except in native shrewdness for the

* Ward, ii., 166 ff.

task. A few sentences taken at random from the letters sufficiently indicate the situation with which he had to grapple:

"It will never do to let the Cardinal whitewash you at the expense of the bishop." "Talbot is entirely Manning's tool (so Neve says), and hears from him three times a week everything great and small." "Fr. Smith is your most powerful enemy . . . says everything you write is satirical." "The English party, of which Ward is the brains, are determined to prevent *your* going to Oxford—on theological grounds." "The Italians think us all, Manning, Talbot, you, Ward, etc., a lot of queer, quarrelsome Inglesi." "We have not yet received our time for an audience with the Pope."

When at length an audience with the Pope (Pio Nono) is obtained, St. John puts the case of the Oxford scheme clearly and forcibly:

"'Holy Father,' I began, 'no one more than Father Newman has spoken of the dangers surrounding a young man going to Oxford, and he has always himself been loth to go there, as he knew his name would attract Catholic students there; but Father Newman is a man of great charity to whom many persons apply, fathers of families and others, and he was greatly desirous to assist those poor souls who might find themselves (by their fathers' doing, not theirs) at Oxford; because circumstances are such in England that there being no Catholic university, parents are driven into great difficulty for the education of their sons. There are dangers everywhere, and it was to meet those dangers that Father Newman at last consented to go (to Oxford) to take the mission.'"*

All the reply this pleading obtained was to the effect that the matter was being referred to the bishops—when it was *from* the counsels of the bishops that Newman was appealing, and had been at the trouble of sending a colleague at his own charges all the way to Rome! This St. John pointed out—with the result that the Pope turned the conversation!

There follow accounts of private interviews with Mgr. Talbot, in which that enigmatic person is brought to book by the loyal and indignant St. John. Eventually some kind of understanding was patched up, and on the whole the mission was effective in establishing the orthodoxy of Newman and improving his relations with the Manning coterie. But, needless to say, he never got to Oxford, nor was his solicitude for the spiritual welfare of young Catholics who found themselves in the City of Destruction ever afforded outlet.

All this is anything but pleasant reading for those who love fair and open dealing, be their view of papal infallibility what

* May 4, 1867. Ward, ii., 166 f.

it may. For the object with which these citations are made is not polemical. As time goes on it becomes increasingly evident that all that is finest in Newman stands apart from the great debate. He may by conviction have belonged to the Roman Church, to the glory of that community, and the envy and disappointment of those outside it; but in spirit and achievement his place is for all time in the great tradition of English humanity. It is our pride to remember that he who now belongs to mankind was of our flesh and of our bones. And if I have ventured to revive the memory of things otherwise well forgotten, it is that we may do justice to the one man on whom devolved the guarding of this national treasure. However we think of Newman—whether as the spiritual Ulysses voyaging *ex umbris et imaginibus in veritatem;* or as one who held aloft the lamp of the ideal amid the clouds and darkness of his age; or as one who wove the supple graces of our speech to such perfection that human thought has scarcely found a more transparent medium—it must, I think, be conceded that the man who stood by him in his direst hours of need, who cared for him with a tenderness rather than of wife or daughter than disciple or son, claims, though he would have been the last to claim it, a place in our national memory along with that Master to whom for thirty years he was unswervingly faithful. If the annals of England have no place for Ambrose St. John it will seem to some of us that all that is most characteristic in Newman's legacy of prose strikes, in addition to its accustomed pathos, the sharper note of sorrow and reproof.

The end was characteristic. The success of Newman's *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* led him to feel that Fessler's work on *True and False Infallibility*, of which he had made effective use in the *Letter*, ought to be made known to English readers. St. John, then headmaster of the Oratory School, threw himself with energy into the task of translating it. "He knew," writes Ward, "as perhaps none of the other Fathers did, how deeply Newman had at heart the work of spreading a strictly theological analysis of Catholic doctrine, such as might win the wider and deeper minds of the coming generation. It was a moment of great and unexpected success and bright hope."* Then the blow fell. St. John broke down from overwork. After some wavering hopes of recovery he died suddenly at Rednal on May 28, 1875. Newman writes a heart-broken letter to Lord Blachford (who, as Sir Frederick Rogers, knew St. John intimately in the Anglican days), from which we may perceive the pathos of that parting as only Newman could make us feel it:

"From the first he loved me with an intensity of love

* Ward, ii., 409.

which was unaccountable. At Rome 28 years ago he was always so working for and relieving me of all trouble that, being young and Saxon-looking, the Romans called him my Angel Guardian. As far as this world was concerned I was his first and last. He has not intermitted this love for an hour up to his last breath. At the beginning of his illness he showed in various ways that he was thinking of and for me. That illness, which threatened permanent loss of reason, which, thank God, he has escaped, arose from his overwork in translating Fessler, which he did for me. . . . On his last morning he parted with great impressiveness from an old friend who had been with him through the night. The latter tells us that he had in former years watched, while with us, before the Blessed Sacrament, but he had never felt our Lord so near him as during that night. He says A.'s face was so beautiful. Both Neville and myself had noticed that . . . his eyes, when he looked straight at us, were brilliant as jewels. . . . I have not time to go through that day. In the course of it, when he was sitting on the side of his bed, he got hold of me and threw his arm over my shoulder and brought me to him so closely that I said in joke, 'He will give me a stiff neck.' So he held me for some minutes, I at length releasing myself from not understanding, as *he* did, why he so clung to me. Then he got hold of my hand and clasped it so tightly as really to frighten me. I had to get one of the others to unlock his fingers, ah! little thinking what he meant. At 7 p.m., when I rose to go and say 'Good-bye,' I shall find you much better to-morrow," he smiled on me with an expression which I could not and cannot understand. It was sweet and sad and perhaps perplexed, but I cannot interpret it. But it was our parting. Neville says he called me back as I was leaving the room, but I do not recollect it.

"About midnight I was awakened with a loud rapping at the door and the tidings that a great change had taken place in him. We hurried off at once, but he had died almost as soon as the messenger started."

MAIOREM HAC DILECTIONEM NEMO HABET, UT ANIMAM SUAM QUIS PONAT PRO AMICO SUO.

THOMAS J. HARDY.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

We hear that, at one of the chief libraries on which clergy rely for their books, not only has the number of books taken out by the clergy been reduced since the war, but there has been a marked change in the type of books read. Whereas before the war the proportion of serious study to light reading was as 80 to 20, to-day it is as 50 to 50. We trust that the full gravity of this fact will be weighed by those in authority. As our correspondent adds, the Bishops could do much to remedy it if they would realize that every Cathedral Chapter should include at least one theologian, whose business it would be to "wait upon this very matter."

M. Albert Houtin, a well-known French writer, has published an able but unsympathetic *Courte Histoire du Christianisme* (Paris, 1924). On p. 117 he pays the following tribute to Anglicanism:

"Par son amour de la Bible, son intérêt persistant, quoiqu'amoindri, pour l'antiquité chrétienne, sa tolérance envers les diverses interprétations dogmatiques, l'épiscopat de cette église représente le mieux celui de la 'grand Église,' celle d'Origène et de Saint Cyprien, celle qui constitua la chrétienté entière, avant que la rivalité des évêques des deux Romes n'eût commencé à la diverser irremédiablement."

A correspondent asks whether we know of "any kind Churchman who could possibly send a poor Lay Reader of twenty-four years' faithful work a copy of Theology to study each month." Can any of our readers help?

CORRESPONDENCE

Sir,

Dr. Brightman has challenged almost all the positions which I maintained in the article in your February number on "Invocation in the Holy Eucharist." I am not convinced by any of the objections which he has raised. I would gladly remain silent, leaving the points of difference between us to the judgment of qualified scholars. But silence might be interpreted either as a discourtesy or as a sign of acquiescence. I will therefore make a few remarks, which will at least indicate to your readers that there is more to be said upon certain matters than could be said in a brief and popular exposition of the subject.

1. In regard to the origin and history of the abbreviation of Sacred Names in early Christian manuscript, I confidently refer to the high authority of the late Dr. Traube in the opening sections of his *Nomina Sacra*.

2. As to the power of the Divine Name as a central conception in Hebrew religion, I would ask scholars who have devoted themselves to Old Testament studies to determine the issue between us. What directly concerns my argument, however, is not so much the extent to which my statement is upheld by modern investigation, as what the Christian writers of the second and third centuries believed in regard to this point. Let me quote a brief passage from "The Apostolic Preaching" of St. Irenaeus, which has but recently come to light in an Armenian version.

At that time God revealed to him the Name which alone is able to save those that believe thereon; and Moses changed the name of Oshea the son of Nun, one of them that were sent, and named him Jesus; and so he sent them forth with the power of the Name, believing that he should receive them back safe and sound through the guidance of the Name.*

It is early Christian belief that is important in this matter of the potency of sacred names. The *locus classicus* is Origen, *Philocalia*, c. xviii. We have to ask what were the thoughts in men's minds when ἐπικαλεῖσθαι and ἐπίκλησις entered in the Christian vocabulary.

3. We shall not arrive at the early significance of ἐπίκλησις by asking what is the particular force of the first part of the compound. It is not derivation but usage which determines the meaning of a word in a particular period. No doubt when the term was established in a special liturgical sense it was natural to explain ἐπίκλησις as a calling *on*, or as a calling *down upon*: but only an examination of current usage will decide whether either of these notions prevailed in the second or third centuries. Happily I am relieved of the necessity of discussing further the words ἐπικαλεῖσθαι and ἐπίκλησις by the fact that Dom Connolly is replying to Mr. Tyrer's strictures (to which Dr. Brightman refers us) in a full dissertation on the subject in the forthcoming number of the *Journal of Theological Studies*. He has kindly allowed me to see the proofs of this article, and I beg scholars to reserve judgment until it has appeared.

4. Dr. Brightman refers to a principle, "the ignoring of which (he says) throughout his article gives a strange colour to Dr. Robinson's theology—the principle, viz., that 'all things whatsoever God did, He did by the operation of the Holy Ghost.'" This by itself suffices to show how completely Dr. Brightman misunderstands the point of view from which I have written. He quotes from St. John of Damascus. No doubt that was a ruling principle in later times. But that it was not a principle suggested by the New Testament writers, who attributed the general action of God upon the world to His Son or Word, is sufficiently proved by Dr. Gore in an instructive passage in his recent work on *The Holy Spirit and the Church* (pp. 9, 17). It was not the general belief of the first three centuries, and is expressly denied by Origen (*De Principiis*, I., iii. 5, in the Greek fragment). I have asked in my article, and I ask again: When first is the Holy Spirit spoken of as consecrating things as distinguished from persons? I am not propounding a "theology"; I am concerned with an historical enquiry. Those who are interested in this particular enquiry will find something to the purpose if they will read a little essay on a part of the subject which I have prefixed to the tract of St. Irenaeus referred to above.

5. Lastly, I draw a contrast between the leading conceptions of the consecration of the Eucharist in the West and in the East. What became from the middle of the fourth century onwards the leading conception in the East—namely, that it was through the agency of the Holy Spirit that the Bread and Wine were made the Body and Blood of Christ—was hardly a possible conception in either East or West in the first three centuries. The parallel between the Eucharist and the Incarnation was early drawn. The belief that it was the Divine Son, the Word, who was directly the agent of His own Incarnation was widespread, if not universal. I have elsewhere, by way of precaution lest I should

* S.P.C.K. edition, p. 94. This question of the change of name is fully dealt with by Justin Martyr in his *Dialogue with the Jew Trypho* (75, 113).

even seem to be putting out some new theory, cited the words of the learned and orthodox Waterland, who, in reference to a passage of St. Irenaeus, says:*

> I may remark, by the way, that Irenaeus here (V., c. 1) seems to understand *Spirit of God*, and *Holy Spirit* before, of the second Person, of the *Logos* himself coming down upon the *Virgin*. So the earliest Fathers commonly do, interpreting Luke i. 35, to that sense.

Thus Waterland, incidentally, though not without a substantial note in proof; but the subject had been dealt with at length, in the great preface of the Benedictine edition of St. Hilary of Poitiers, by Dom Pierre Coutant in 1693.

That the interpretation of the Eucharist followed on the same lines was an almost necessary consequence. It is the Divine Son, the Word Himself, who is thought of as the agent in the process. In the fourth century, however, an ascription of the change in the Elements to the agency of the Holy Spirit accompanies in the East the new emphasis laid on His agency in the process of the Incarnation. But the West made no corresponding alteration in its Liturgy (with occasional exceptions in Spain and Gaul in the sixth and seventh centuries), however much its theologians may have recognized the justice of the view held and expressed in the more theologically-minded East.

That in later days Paschasius Radbertus in the West, and Simeon of Thessalonica in the East, combine both conceptions in their expositions does not concern us when we are dealing with the early history of Eucharistic doctrine and practice. That St. Chrysostom had spoken long before of the action of our Lord as Priest and Consecrator is in no way surprising; would anyone anywhere have denied it? The question before us is: What were the leading ideas which found stereotyped expression in the developed Liturgies of the West and the East respectively? And then a further question arises for ourselves, on which difference of opinion is legitimate enough: Is it desirable that we at this moment should seek to introduce into our Western Liturgy a conception which, however true it may be in itself, is not in our Prayer Book, and which would, if now introduced, involve or suggest a fresh departure from the normal tradition of the West?

I remain, Sir, yours faithfully,
J. Armitage Robinson.

The Deanery, Wells.
July 15, 1924.

REVIEW

The Book of the Lover and the Beloved. Translated from the Catalan of Ramon Lull, with an Introductory Essay by E. Allison Peers. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

Strictly speaking, this is the first complete English translation of an important but too little-known work in the history of Mysticism. Complete, if only because Prof. Peers has added passages found only in the editions of Paris (1505) and Valencia (1521), though it is doubtful if even the oldest text (fourteenth

* In his book on *The Trinity* (1734), c. vi. (Works, iii. 571; Oxford, 1843).

century) has ever been fully Englished before. Important, in the present state of mysticism in England and elsewhere, for three reasons chiefly.

1. Ramon Lull was a Franciscan Tertiary, and one *desideratum* in mysticism is a comparison between St. Bonaventura and, for example, St. Thomas Aquinas in respect of the theology, *askesis* and "psychology" of mystic life and contemplation. Despite Prof. E. Gilson's researches, we have as yet no full account of the change the thirteenth century—Lull was born in Majorca in 1235 and martyred in Africa in 1315—was introducing into the idea of "personality," the function of the senses in the acquisition of truth, and the more or less Platonic theories of the Franciscans and of St. Bernard himself, that the soul is an independent entity and the body the soul's tomb and defiling tenement. Moreover, St. Bernard and St. Bonaventura laid a one-sided emphasis upon St. Augustine's doctrine of the "inner Christ or Teacher" (*Interius Doctor*), and so ran the risk of quietism and a false immanence by their teaching that the soul had simply to turn in upon itself to discover truth and knowledge there. I am not suggesting that these masters were even semi-quietists. After all, Christianity itself—to say nothing of so-called mediævalism—is too objective for such subjectivity. And subjectivist Lull is not; nor is he an immanentist and confuser of introspection with introversion. No doubt he has been called the "Spanish Fool of God," the "Majorcan Jacopone da Todi." Menéndez Pelayo calls him this—undeservedly, I think. For though he can say with Jacopone "senno me pare a cortesia empazir per lo bel Messia," he keeps his balance—some might say because he is philosopher as well as mystic. Some, too, will probably go on till the end of time tainting him with Sufism—Lull had lived so long in the East. But is this alleged Sufism really more than the sun of Africa—the passion of the Augustine of the *Confessions*, the "fierceness" of the Tertullian of the *Apology?* Forerunner of St. John of the Cross Lull certainly is, but the *Libre de Amich e Amat*—to give the book its original title—reveals nothing of that Orientalism which Abbot Cuthbert Butler professes to find even in the author of *The Ascent of Mount Carmel*. Esotericism, negations of the body, depersonalization—there is nothing of this. Can the like be said of his Italian fellow-Franciscan Jacopone—Jacopone who went through the streets of Todi on his hands and feet, ambling like an ass, with a saddle on his back and a bit in his mouth? Lull too, like Jacopone, sings the uncloistered Franciscan love; he is, perhaps, the only "jongleur" of God that Majorca gave to the *Poverello*, but he is no "anti-intellec-

tualist." He sings and loves with Reason as his mistress and teacher, but it is Reason born, not of his alleged identification of theology and philosophy, but of Love—and Jesus is Reason, and all the more Reason when He is Flame.

2. It may be asked then, in the second place, whether the Dean of St. Paul's is not too sweeping and eclectic when he characterizes the mysticism of Spain as purely " psychological " and, apparently, as non-intellectual also, because " its point of departure is not the notion of Being or of Unity, but the human soul seeking reconciliation with God." " Intellect " is an elastic and elusive word, more especially in these days when modern knowledge is throwing light on the nature of intelligence and the psychology of Reasoning. Moreover, the researches of Morel-Fatio and Echegoyen—to name no others —alone show that further investigations are needed on Teresian and pre-Teresian Spanish mysticism. Lull may not hold the Neo-platonic view of Being and Union, but the Being of God and union with God are none the less the substantial themes of his *Libre de Amich e Amat*. Indeed, the book is strictly a study in the *via contemplativa*, and this *via* was the essence of Christian devotion till Occam supplanted it by the modern theory of the *via activa*.

3. There is a third point. Some of Lull's views on other subjects may be questionable enough, but his book of *The Lover and the Beloved* has a special value for our day. Its mysticism is Evangelical in the best sense of that word. Again, it deals with the great elementals and fundamentals of the soul, and not with quasi-philosophical or theosophical speculations. Once more, Lull, as a mystic, is in line with the great spiritual masters and with Fénelon, as against Bossuet, in teaching that the action of the Supernatural in what is called the " higher stages " of Prayer and the mystic life is due not to God's miraculous intervention or to so-called " intuition," but rather to the normal development of the whole Self responding by the exercise of its freewill to the calls and operations of grace, prayer, and devotedness to God. It has been said that the controversy between Bossuet and Fénelon as to the Supernatural " est à refaire." Gone into afresh it will certainly have to be if we are to preserve a " sane " mysticism in Anglo-catholicism. Even in our Religious Houses we can find the poison of pseudo-mysticism, intuitionalism and quietism. À *refaire* also is the advice of St. Bonaventura and St. Teresa, that rationalism and humanitarianism (and a humanitarian ethic is one of our greatest dangers to-day) are to be opposed not only by an apologetic of intellect and learning, but also by the apologetic of devotion and the great elementals of the soul

and religion—love, prayer, penitence, patience, humility, a fiery adventurousness, and the study of the Being of God in itself, and not merely of His becoming and effecting in history and activities. Here is Ramon Lull's message to our anæmic spirituality—he learnt it from his master, St. Bonaventura: "If thou wouldest know how these things are done, question grace, not doctrine; desire, not understanding; the sob of prayer, not the study of texts; the Bridegroom, not the master; God, not man; darkness, not clarity; not light, but the fire that inflames utterly and transforms into God with excessive fervour and most ardent love."

The present reviewer is acquainted with Castilian and some forms of Catalan only, while the *Book of the Lover and the Beloved* is written in idiom, Lull's own Catalan-provenzal, but, as far as he can judge, Prof. Peers has done his work admirably—inwardly too, for surely, if he has never made the ascent, he knows at least the road to Mount Carmel.

THE ABBOT OF PERSHORE.

NOTICE

LIFE OF ST. DAVID. By A. W. Wade-Evans. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

This addition to the series of *Lives of the Celtic Saints* maintains the high standard set by the earlier volumes; it puts into our hands a wide and pertinent selection of materials, the study of which will be worth half-a-dozen works dealing with this ground at second-hand. The "Life" here translated is that by Rhygyvarch, written somewhere about the year 1000. The translation is a revised form of that provided for the text printed by Mr. Wade-Evans in *Y Cymmrodor* in 1913. To it have been added translations of relevant passages from other Lives, such as that of St. Aeddan of Ferns, St. Cadog, and others. The whole makes a most useful and welcome collection of materials, for which the careful and scholarly introduction supplies all the necessary orientation. A sketch-map illustrating the many geographical references would have been useful, but the notes contain such full and detailed stores of information that they alone make the book a valuable and very acceptable addition to the student's library.

J. H. BAXTER.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER